



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 2009

No. 52

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

Reverend Gary Shaw, Central Christian Center, Joplin, Missouri, offered the following prayer:

Father, as I stand in this beautiful hall of honor, my heart overflows with admiration and appreciation for those who have occupied this place throughout history representing the citizens of this great country.

May Your divine wisdom, Your unbiased judgment and Your love fill each of those who have chosen to serve our Nation. May they draw from Your fountain of knowledge and Your storehouse of fair play as they administer and create legislation that governs our land. Instill in all of us a respect, honor and a love for life that will allow us to serve with pride and dignity at all levels of local, State, and national government.

Help us to put on the shield of faith and to face the challenges before us with a determination that we will succeed and prosper because we operate in Your providential and divine order.

Please bless America and help us honor You.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND GARY SHAW

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, it's my honor today to welcome for the opening prayer a respected leader and a friend of mine, Reverend Gary Shaw of Central Christian Center in Joplin, Missouri. Reverend Shaw is an elder and trustee at the Central Christian Center and has served there as executive administrator for the past 30 years.

In addition to his church work, Reverend Shaw is the mayor of the city of Joplin in southwest Missouri. Joplin is the second largest city in my congressional district. It serves a four-State area as a center for commerce, education, health care, and transportation.

Gary Shaw has spent several years in service to the city of Joplin, and I am thankful for Reverend Shaw's committed efforts to the city as a member of several committees and leadership boards. His work to improve business, safety, and historic preservation in his community and State does not go unnoticed.

He's a devoted father and husband. He's been married to his best friend, Kathy, for 46 years and has one son, Brian, a local businessman. A veteran of the United States Army, a graduate of Ozark Christian College in Joplin, Reverend Shaw has also been a witness for his faith in over 30 countries.

It's truly my honor to welcome Reverend Shaw to the House today and thank him for his service to Missouri and many years of dedicated service to the city of Joplin.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five further requests for 1-

minute speeches from each side of the aisle.

HONORING THE LIFE OF U.S. MARINE CORPORAL MIKE OUELLETTE

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor U.S. Marine Corporal Mike Ouellette of Manchester, New Hampshire. Corporal Ouellette was tragically killed in action on Sunday, March 22, during a foot patrol in the Helmand Province in Afghanistan. He was 28 years old.

Corporal Ouellette leaves behind his parents, Donna Ouellette and Leonard Ouellette, a brother Alan, and a sister Stephanie. I extend my deepest sympathies to Corporal Ouellette's family, who are in my thoughts and prayers.

We also honor the courage and the sacrifice of Corporal Anthony Williams, 21, of Oxford, Pennsylvania, who was killed alongside Corporal Ouellette.

Corporal Ouellette was a patriot who was twice deployed to Iraq and was serving his third tour of duty with the 3rd Battalion, 8th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, 2nd Marine Expeditionary Force.

Corporal Ouellette graduated from Memorial High School in Manchester, New Hampshire, in 1999 and studied at the Manchester School of Technology before he enlisted in the United States Marine Corps on June 15, 2005. I spoke with his father last night, who said his son just wanted to help people. Corporal Ouellette was best known for his friendly and outgoing nature and will be missed by many. He was a blessing to his community. He dedicated his life to the service of his family, his friends, and his country.

Our country owes Corporal Ouellette and his family a debt we cannot repay.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4029

We salute Corporal Ouellette's selfless sacrifice, service and bravery. America was honored to call him our son.

WHITE HOUSE BUDGET

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, next week the House is going to vote on the administration's budget that spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much. Every day, American families need to make tough decisions to balance their budgets. If they end up in the red each month, they are in trouble. But not the Federal Government.

The administration says spend, spend, spend. The White House budget raises taxes on hardworking Americans in the middle of a recession. Americans say "no new taxes." They don't want us to raise taxes during a recession. They know that it is not the way to get this economy moving again. Our children and grandchildren deserve better. Let's clean the budget up.

We used to say, "It's the spending, stupid."

A PROMISING BUDGET

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this Congress' Budget Committee worked long into the night last night to prepare a budget for the House to vote on. It's a budget that cuts the deficit by two-thirds by the year 2013, and gives a tax cut for 95 percent of the American people.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the middle class and 95 percent of the people will get a tax cut, not simply the upper 1 percent who have gotten the tax cuts while we have been Bush-whacked over the 8 years of the Bush-Cheney Presidency and a Congress that's now run off the tracks and threatened the world's economy.

We're going to invest in health care to give people affordable health care, invest in education so the Chinese don't lead us in science and math, and we can maintain our position as the world's number one economic power and also invest in renewable energies so we're not dependent on Middle Eastern oil, and a Defense Department that needs to protect those routes to keep America secure; a budget that is a promising budget for the future to create jobs.

I am proud of the Budget Committee and look forward to supporting the President.

NO NEW TAXES

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, this budget of the President taxes too much, it borrows too much, and it spends way too much money. And the focus of the White House should be on what they can do to generate economic growth rather than finding new ways to tax our families, hardworking families. And we hear they are going to be taxed to the tune of \$1.9 trillion—with a "T"—in new taxes.

My constituents have had enough of this economic abuse and so have our children and our grandchildren. They don't want the government to continue to spend money they have not made for programs that they do not want. They are worried about the future of their small businesses, they are worried about their retirement plans, and they are worried about the future of those children and grandchildren. So Republicans are offering an alternative that will be there to help ensure our economic prosperity.

I would encourage all of my colleagues to support this alternative because Americans deserve more than wasteful government spending at unprecedented levels. They deserve freedom and economic prosperity.

□ 1015

COVER THE UNINSURED WEEK

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. This week, once again, we observe Cover the Uninsured Week, something we do every year. You know, the United States is a world leader in so many respects, but are we ever a poor example to follow on health care coverage.

As many as 47 million Americans lack insurance, and many more we know are underinsured. In most instances, they lack access to quality health care, especially primary and preventive care.

Our country has dug itself into a hole so deep, I'm afraid there isn't one simple solution to the puzzle of covering the uninsured. Thankfully, we have already begun to take important steps, such as expanding the Children's Health Insurance Program and assisting unemployed individuals struggling to pay COBRA premiums.

But we have so much more work to do. We must finally extend coverage to all Americans, and we must do it this year.

Let's give real meaning to the phrase "cover the uninsured" and have something to celebrate next year.

OBAMA'S BUDGET BORROWING TOO MUCH

(Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, it's becoming increasingly clear to Americans all across this country that President Obama's budget spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much. No one in the history of the world has ever borrowed so much money. How much? Right now we're borrowing about \$1 million each minute.

The Obama budget would double the national debt in 5 years, triple it in 10 years. Think about the impact that's going to have on our country. The Federal Government is showering itself with money while small businesses and families all across this country are continuing to have to tighten their belts and make tough decisions.

I think about my son, Cole, who will be 2 next month, and by the time he's my age, he's going to face a doubling of the tax burden. It's not sustainable. It is not fiscally responsible. We can do better and we must do better.

History teaches us that the Pharaohs drove Egypt to bankruptcy building the pyramids. At least they got pyramids. All we're going to have is a mountain of debt.

WHO SHOULD GET THE BONUSES

(Mr. ISRAEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning on behalf of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Caucus. There has been a lot of talk and controversy on the floor about bonuses for America's executives. Let me tell you who I believe really deserve bonuses.

It's the energy entrepreneurs who are working every single day to develop the new technologies that will end our dependence on foreign oil. It's the people on Long Island who are working on LED lighting and biofuels; the people at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Golden, Colorado, who are working on battery storage; the people at General Motors who are working on plug-in hybrids; the people at Brookhaven National Labs who are working on nanotech; the venture capitalists and the investors and the engineers and the researchers and the developers who are bringing new technologies to market which will reduce our dependence on foreign oil once and for all, which will create a new generation of jobs, which will expand our economy, and which will reduce energy costs.

Those are the people who are creating a new future for America's economy, and those are the people who we should be rewarding with bonuses and our appreciation.

BUDGET GIMMICKS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the President has disparaged budget gimmicks and declared "a return to honest budgeting." Yet his plan then goes on to claim \$1.5 billion in war "savings" that are nothing more than an illusion, just the kind of gimmick he has disparaged.

The President's budget claims \$1.6 trillion in "savings" and \$1.5 trillion in "deficit reduction" by claiming the already determined drawdown in troops as a reduction in spending. Put another way, the administration budget assumes an elevated path of war spending that was never going to be followed, and then claims savings through a reduction that was going to occur anyway.

This war games budget gimmick ends up representing three-quarter of their so-called savings.

The President isn't making any attempt to reduce spending. He has constructed an unrealistically high future spending projection, and then claimed as savings the difference between this fictional budget world and reality.

We need to get spending under control, not budget gimmicks.

HONORING MRS. MYRTIS DENSON MAYO

(Mr. CHILDERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHILDERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of America's most exceptional women. Today is indeed a grand day in Prentiss County, Mississippi, because today, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Myrtis Denson Mayo and all who love her are celebrating 102 years of a life well-lived, one who has sewn every garment she has ever worn. A rich life rewarded by 6 children, 19 grandchildren, 31 great-grandchildren and 20 great-great-grandchildren. Her extraordinary life is one of a great faith in God, with a love and appreciation for all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor this humble and gentle lady and commend her on her 102nd birthday, and further, I am proud to be one of the thousands of people positively influenced by my wife's grandmother, Mrs. Myrtis Denson Mayo.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT CONGRESS TO PUT ITS FISCAL HOUSE IN ORDER

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. After years of runaway spending at the Federal level, the American people want this Congress to put our fiscal house in order. Instead, President Barack Obama has brought forward the most fiscally irresponsible budget in American history. The President's budget spends too much, borrows too much, and taxes too much, and the American people know it.

The American people don't want more spending, more government, and

more bailouts. They don't want to see this President's budget result in, as CBO projected, nearly \$1 trillion in annual deficits for the next 10 years.

The President's budget would actually double the national debt in just 6 years, and even worse, the President's budget pays for all this spending with higher taxes on virtually every American, small business, and a light-switch tax that would raise utility rates for every American household by more than \$3,000.

Today, Republicans will continue to offer better solutions, unveiling today a blueprint for recovery that's built on fiscal discipline, growth, and reform.

Let the debate begin.

FEDERAL LAND ASSISTANCE, MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISRAEL). Pursuant to House Resolution 281 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1404.

□ 1023

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1404) to authorize a supplemental funding source for catastrophic emergency wildland fire suppression activities on Department of the Interior and National Forest System lands, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a cohesive wildland fire management strategy, and for other purposes, with Mr. PASTOR of Arizona (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 25, 2009, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1404

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Federal Land Assistance, Management and Enhancement Act" or "FLAME Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Flame Fund for catastrophic emergency wildland fire suppression activities.
- Sec. 3. Cohesive wildland fire management strategy.
- Sec. 4. Review of certain wildfires to evaluate cost containment in wildland fire suppression activities.
- Sec. 5. Reducing risk of wildfires in fire-ready communities.

SEC. 2. FLAME FUND FOR CATASTROPHIC EMERGENCY WILDLAND FIRE SUPPRESSION ACTIVITIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term "Federal land" means the following:

(A) Public lands, as defined in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(B) Units of the National Park System.

(C) Refuges of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

(D) Lands held in trust by the United States for the benefit of Indian tribes or individual Indians.

(E) Lands in the National Forest System, as defined in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)).

(2) FLAME FUND.—The term "Flame Fund" means the Federal Land Assistance, Management, and Enhancement Fund established by this section.

(3) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term "Secretary concerned" means—

(A) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to Federal land described in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of paragraph (1); and

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to National Forest System land.

(4) SECRETARIES.—The term "Secretaries" means the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, acting jointly.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT AND AVAILABILITY OF FLAME FUND.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the Federal Land Assistance, Management, and Enhancement Fund.

(2) CONTENTS.—The Flame Fund shall consist of the following amounts:

(A) Amounts appropriated to the Flame Fund pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (c).

(B) Amounts transferred to the Flame Fund pursuant to subsection (d).

(3) AVAILABILITY.—Subject to subsection (e), amounts in the Flame Fund shall be available to the Secretaries to pay the costs of catastrophic emergency wildland fire suppression activities that are separate from amounts annually appropriated to the Secretaries for the predicted annual workload for wildland fire suppression activities, based on analyses of historical workloads and anticipated increased workloads due to changing environmental or demographic conditions.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Flame Fund such amounts as may be necessary to carry out this section. It is the intent of Congress that the amount appropriated to the Flame Fund for fiscal year 2010 and each fiscal year thereafter should be not less than the average amount expended by the Secretaries for emergency wildland fire suppression activities over the five fiscal years preceding that fiscal year.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DESIGNATION OF FLAME FUND APPROPRIATIONS AS EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) the amounts appropriated to the Flame Fund should be designated as amounts necessary to meet emergency needs; and

(B) the new budget authority and outlays resulting therefrom should not count for the purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(3) NOTICE OF INSUFFICIENT FUNDS.—The Secretaries shall notify the congressional committees specified in subsection (h)(2) whenever only an estimated two months worth of funding remains in the Flame Fund.

(d) TRANSFER OF EXCESS WILDLAND FIRE SUPPRESSION AMOUNTS INTO FLAME FUND.—

At the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary concerned shall transfer to the Flame Fund amounts appropriated to the Secretary concerned for wildland fire suppression activities for the fiscal year, but not obligated for wildland fire suppression activities before the end of the fiscal year.

(e) **USE OF FLAME FUND.**—

(1) **DECLARATION REQUIRED.**—Amounts in the Flame Fund shall be made available to the Secretary concerned only after the Secretaries issue a declaration that a wildland fire suppression activity is eligible for funding from the Flame Fund.

(2) **DECLARATION CRITERIA.**—A declaration by the Secretaries under paragraph (1) shall be based on the following criteria:

(A) In the case of an individual wildland fire incident—

- (i) the fire covers 300 or more acres;
- (ii) the severity of the fire, which may be based on incident complexity or the potential for increased complexity; and
- (iii) the threat posed by the fire, including the potential for loss of lives, property, or critical resources.

(B) Consistent with subsection (f), in the case of a firefighting season, when the cumulative costs of wildland fire suppression activities for the Secretary concerned are projected to exceed amounts annually appropriated for such activities.

(3) **TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS TO SECRETARY CONCERNED.**—After issuance of a declaration under paragraph (1) and upon the request of the Secretary concerned, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the Flame Fund to the Secretary concerned such amounts as the Secretaries determine are necessary for wildland fire suppression activities associated with the declared suppression emergency.

(4) **STATE, PRIVATE, AND TRIBAL LAND.**—Use of the Flame Fund for catastrophic emergency wildland fire suppression activities on State and private land and, where applicable, tribal land shall be consistent with existing agreements where the Secretaries have agreed to assume responsibility for wildland fire suppression activities on the land.

(f) **TREATMENT OF ANTICIPATED AND PREDICTED ACTIVITIES.**—The Secretary concerned shall continue to fund anticipated and predicted wildland fire suppression activities within the appropriate agency budget for each fiscal year. Use of the additional funding made available through the Flame Fund is intended to supplement the budgeted and appropriated agency funding and is to be used only for purposes and in instances consistent with this section.

(g) **PROHIBITION ON OTHER TRANSFERS.**—All amounts in the Flame Fund, as well as all funds appropriated for the purpose of wildland fire suppression on Federal land, must be obligated before the Secretary concerned may transfer funds from non-fire accounts for wildland fire suppression.

(h) **ACCOUNTING AND REPORTS.**—

(1) **ACCOUNTING AND REPORTING SYSTEM.**—The Secretaries shall establish an accounting and reporting system for the Flame Fund compatible with existing National Fire Plan reporting procedures.

(2) **ANNUAL REPORT; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretaries shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Agriculture, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Committee on Indian Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate an annual report on the use of the funds from the Flame Fund, together with any recommendations that the Secretaries may have to improve the administrative control and oversight of the Flame Fund.

The annual report shall be made available to the public.

(3) **ESTIMATES OF WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION COSTS TO IMPROVE BUDGETING AND FUNDING.**—

(A) **PERIODIC ESTIMATES.**—Consistent with the schedule provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretaries shall submit to the committees specified in paragraph (2) an estimate of anticipated wildfire suppression costs for the current fiscal year and the following fiscal year. The methodology for developing the estimates shall be subject to periodic peer review to ensure compliance with subparagraph (C).

(B) **SUBMISSION SCHEDULE.**—The Secretaries shall submit an estimate under subparagraph (A) during—

- (i) the first week of February of each year;
- (ii) the first week of April of each year;
- (iii) the first week of July of each year; and

(iv) if the bill making appropriations for operations of the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service for the following fiscal year has not been enacted by September 1, the first week of September of each year.

(C) **BASIS.**—An estimate of anticipated wildfire suppression costs shall be developed using the best available—

- (i) climate, weather, and other relevant data; and
- (ii) models and other analytic tools.

SEC. 3. COHESIVE WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY.

(a) **STRATEGY REQUIRED.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a report that contains a cohesive wildland fire management strategy, consistent with the recommendations contained in recent Comptroller General reports regarding this issue.

(b) **ELEMENTS OF STRATEGY.**—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall address the findings of the Comptroller General in the reports referred to in such subsection and include the following elements:

- (1) A system to identify the most cost effective means for allocating fire management budget resources.
- (2) An illustration of plans by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to reinvest in non-fire programs.
- (3) A description of how the Secretaries will employ appropriate management response.
- (4) A system for assessing the level of risk to communities.
- (5) A system to ensure that the highest priority fuels reduction projects are being funded first.

SEC. 4. REVIEW OF CERTAIN WILDFIRES TO EVALUATE COST CONTAINMENT IN WILDLAND FIRE SUPPRESSION ACTIVITIES.

(a) **REVIEW REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct a review, using independent panels, of each wildfire incident for which the Secretary concerned incurs expenses in excess of \$10,000,000.

(b) **REPORT.**—The Secretary concerned shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Agriculture, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Committee on Indian Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report containing the results of each review conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 5. REDUCING RISK OF WILDFIRES IN FIRE-READY COMMUNITIES.

(a) **FIRE-READY COMMUNITY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “fire-ready community” means a community that—

- (1) is located within a priority area identified pursuant to subsection (b);

(2) has a cooperative fire agreement that articulates the roles and responsibilities for Federal, State and local government entities in local wildfire suppression and protection;

(3) has local codes that require fire-resistant home design and building materials;

(4) has a community wildfire protection plan (as defined in section 101 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6502)); and

(5) is engaged in a successful collaborative process that includes multiple interested persons representing diverse interests and is transparent and nonexclusive, such as a resource advisory committee established under section 205 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-393; 16 U.S.C. 500 note).

(b) **FIRE RISK MAPPING.**—As soon as is practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior (in this section referred to as the “Secretaries”) shall develop regional maps of communities most at risk of wildfire and in need of hazardous fuel treatment and maintenance. The maps shall identify priority areas for hazardous fuels reduction projects, including—

- (1) at-risk communities in fire-prone areas of the wildland-urban interface (as defined in section 101 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6502));
- (2) watersheds and municipal drinking water sources;

- (3) emergency evacuation corridors;
- (4) electricity transmission corridors; and
- (5) low-capacity or low-income communities.

(c) **LOCAL WILDLAND FIREFIGHTING CAPABILITY GRANTS.**—

(1) **GRANTS AVAILABLE.**—The Secretaries may provide cost-share grants to fire-ready communities to assist such communities in carrying out activities authorized by paragraph (2).

(2) **ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.**—Grant funds may be used for the following:

(A) Education programs to raise awareness of homeowners and citizens about wildland fire protection practices, including FireWise or similar programs.

(B) Training programs for local firefighters on wildland firefighting techniques and approaches.

(C) Equipment acquisition to facilitate wildland fire preparedness.

(D) Implementation of a community wildfire protection plan.

(d) **WILDLAND FIRE COST-SHARE AGREEMENTS.**—In developing any wildland fire cost-share agreement with a State Forester or equivalent official, the Secretaries shall, to the greatest extent possible, encourage the State and local communities involved to become fire-ready communities.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretaries to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in House Report 111-52. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be not subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. RAHALL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 111-52.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. RAHALL:
Page 5, beginning line 3, strike paragraph (2) (and redesignate the subsequent paragraph accordingly).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, the pending measure contains a sense of the Congress resolution regarding the budgetary treatment of the FLAME fund. We've been working with the Budget Committee on this matter and appreciate their interest in this legislation, and as such, I no longer see a need for the sense of Congress provision. My amendment simply strikes it from the bill, and I ask for adoption of the amendment.

I reserve my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I'm not in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, as introduced, this bill contained sense of Congress language that the chairman talked about.

Since the severity of wildfires and cost of suppressing them have grown enormously in recent years as a result of the tinderbox conditions we have allowed to develop in this country, I understand why the bill sought to deal with the requirements of the Budget Act this way because, after all, we really have no choice but to try to bring the fires under control and limit their destructiveness.

Although, I can understand how this amendment came to be, because apparently the Budget Committee must feel differently with the massive deficits that we face under the President's proposed budget, and I can see why the Budget Committee is concerned about taking the FLAME fund off budget.

Nevertheless, I think this is the right amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. PERLMUTTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 111-52.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. PERLMUTTER:

Page 4, line 15, insert after the period the following new sentence: "Authorized suppression activities include containment activities in response to crisis insect infestations to reduce the likelihood of wildfires."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, I would begin by thanking the chairman of the committee, Mr. RAHALL, for bringing this critical bill to the floor today.

One of the most pressing dangers posed by wildfires is the thousands of acres of dead woods and dead trees caused by invasive species, particularly the bark beetle in my own State of Colorado and throughout the Rocky Mountain West.

These insects have created literally millions of square miles of dead forest which endanger thousands of communities should they ignite into flames.

This amendment simply clarifies that the FLAME fund can be used for containment activities to prevent a burning fire from reaching dangerously infested areas, which pose a higher risk of the intensification and spread of that wildfire.

While not regionally specific, my amendment is especially relevant to the Rocky Mountain West.

From Canada down to New Mexico, the bark beetle epidemic has been called "the largest known insect infestation in the history of North America." This epidemic has the potential to cripple our communities, our forests, our tourism sector, our economy, and our way of life in Colorado.

But heaven forbid a forest fire should start in an infected area; far more will be lost.

The effects of the bark beetle infestation are apparent in the transformation of our mountain landscape, which has been described as turning "a blanket of green forest into a blanket of rust red." To put this transformation into perspective, in my own State of Colorado and in Wyoming in 2006, there were 1 million acres of dead trees. In 2008, it is expected to total over 2 million. These acres of dead trees trigger and perpetuate catastrophic fire risk and scope.

The FLAME Act will play an instrumental role in helping to suppress these catastrophic wildfires.

My amendment will explain further and make clear the Secretary of the Interior's and the Secretary of Agriculture's authority to provide suppression activities in response to crisis insect infestations.

□ 1030

I ask for the Members to support this important amendment.

With that, I yield to the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. RAHALL. I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado yielding. I'm happy to accept his amendment and appreciate his work on this legislation.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I'm not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado is intended, rightfully so, to clarify the fire suppression authority under this Act as it relates to the severe insect infestation problem in our national forests.

Although I support the amendment, I must point out that prevention is far more cost-effective than fire suppression, and until we in Congress act on measures that promote sound scientific forest management and allow the related industries to survive, we are really not comprehensively addressing this problem.

Nevertheless, this is a good amendment. I support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chair, I just ask for an "aye" vote on amendment No. 2.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 111-52.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk to the Federal Land Assistance, Management and Enhancement Act.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. POLIS:
Page 11, after line 4, insert the following new subsection:

(c) REVISION.—At least once during every five-year period initially beginning on the date of the submission of the cohesive wildland fire management strategy under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a revised strategy that takes into consideration changes affecting

the elements of the strategy specified in subsection (b) during the five-year period, in particular changes with respect to landscape, vegetation, climate, and weather.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to thank Chairman RAHALL and his staff for their leadership on an intelligent and important bill that will do a world of good work for districts like mine in the West and other districts across the country where people live, work and play in and around our public lands.

With the establishment of the FLAME Fund, our Nation's land management agencies are freed from the overbearing costs of fighting wildfires and once again will be able to focus their efforts on the local communities and public land users they were created to serve, as well as fire prevention.

This bill also, finally, guarantees that a cohesive wildfire management strategy is completed and put into place, a strategy that is long overdue and the absence of which has already damaged wildfire suppression efforts across our country.

Mr. Chairman, this vital cohesive plan, which has been called for time and time again by the General Accountability Office, is kept up-to-date and remains an effective tool as years go by.

My district in Colorado is a prime example of why we need an ever-evolving fire management plan. We have been hit hard by the mountain pine beetle infestation, an epidemic that has killed millions of acres of trees, turning the area into a potential powder keg for fire risk, and brought the threat of wildfires into our backyards in ways that we could not have predicted prior to the outbreak.

Over the past 10 years, the outbreak has spread to more and more areas and is now hitting newer species of pine.

Climate modeling predicts that a large change in the frequency of precipitation and the intensity of droughts in the area could only add increasing wildfire risks. My district is already experiencing the effects of climate change, and any national wildfire plan needs to change in step with our environment.

My amendment ensures that the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture work to continually update the cohesive fire management plan by requiring that they provide a revised plan at least once every 5 years that takes into account community needs and our changing climate.

We owe it to our brave firefighters and the efficiency-minded taxpayers to ensure that this fundamental part of wildfire management policy stays up-to-date and doesn't let our communities fall by the way side.

Mr. Chair, this amendment and this bill are vitally important to ensuring responsible national wildfire policy. I urge passage of the amendment and the underlying bill.

I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado yielding, and congratulate him for his superb leadership and work on this bill, and we accept the amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have no objection to the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado. I know that most Forest Service employers are very frustrated over the extent to which their time is spent producing the paperwork needed to defend against or head off lawsuits. I am sure many in Congress have heard me say that as a result of these lawsuits, they spend far more time developing forest plans than implementing them. But in the case of keeping the forest fire wildfire strategy current, it makes sense to revise them from time to time.

In a few short years, drought, beetle infestation or forest life cycle can transform a forest, and what may have once been a very appropriate fire management strategy may no longer be relevant.

I hope that the Forest Service will be able to update the cohesive wildlife management strategy in a timely manner, without delays or other challenges posed by irresponsible environmental lawsuits.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield back the balance of my time and ask for approval of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS
OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 111-52.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

Page 11, after line 4, insert the following new subsection:

(c) NOTICE OF PRESCRIBED FIRES.—As part of the strategy required by subsection (a) for the Forest Service, the Secretary of Agriculture shall ensure that, before any prescribed fire is used on National Forest System land, owners of adjacent private land are notified in writing of the date and scope of the prescribed fire.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment can best be described as a "good neighbor amendment." This amendment will require advanced notice in writing to land owners adjacent to National Forest system lands whenever the Forest Service sets a prescribed burn.

It is important for all of us who are government officials to treat every American with respect. We owe it to neighboring property owners to let them know what we are doing when our actions may affect them.

Fires, even prescribed burns, can be dramatic events. It is simply a courtesy to keep our neighbors informed.

This commonsense amendment was included in the version of the FLAME Act that passed the House under suspension of the rules by a voice vote last year.

Some might say that the burden of notifying neighbors is too great. I suspect these are people who don't live next to national forests and they don't understand what challenges a prescribed burn can have. It is a lot more expensive to face lawsuits from private landowners who weren't given enough warning to prepare for possible problems than it might come from notifying them of a prescribed burn.

Mr. RAHALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. With that, Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAHALL. I appreciate the gentleman's amendment, and thank him for it. We would be glad to accept it on this side.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS
OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 111-52.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

Page 11, line 12, insert after the period the following new sentence: "The review of a wildfire incident shall include an assessment of what actions, if any, could have been taken in advance of the fire that may have prevented the fire or at least reduced the severity of the fire."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, Einstein's definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result. In order not to be a continuing example of Einstein's observation, this bill wisely requires the Secretaries to conduct a review of major wildlife incidents and report the results of the review to Congress.

My amendment simply directs that these reports include an assessment of what actions could have been taken before the fire that would have prevented or lessened the severity of the fire. I believe my amendment will increase the value and usefulness of the information gathered, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. RAHALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. We accept the amendment on this side.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I urge adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 111-52.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

Page 11, line 12, insert after the period the following new sentence: "The review of a wildfire incident shall include an assessment of the quantity of greenhouse gases produced as a result of the fire."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, the President has proposed that

the Federal Government impose a cap-and-trade system aimed at limiting and reducing carbon emissions in our country. This cap-and-trade system is really a national energy tax that could cost \$2 trillion. As a result of that, American families could pay up to \$3,100 per year in higher energy and fuel costs.

Let's set aside the fact that our economy can't afford such a massive new tax on such basic essential services as electricity. Let's also set aside the fact that we'd be handicapping the American worker and small business by imposing such a tax when China and India are unapologetically racing to expand carbon emissions in their country.

The President's cap-and-trade scheme aims to curb manmade carbon emissions, but the bill before us today is about wildfires—and the fact is that we know very little about the massive carbon emissions created by such fires.

Yet, what little information we do have on wildfires is absolutely astonishing. For example, the 2003 Hayman fire in Colorado produced more CO₂ than was produced by the entire population of the State of Colorado in a single year.

My amendment simply directs the Forest Service to gather information on the emissions of wildfires because such knowledge is an essential component in making national policy decisions on greenhouse gases that are based on facts and proven science and not conjecture and unproven consensus.

We can't afford to impose a \$2 trillion energy tax on our economy and on American families and small businesses, especially when we weren't even aware of the massive carbon outputs of wildfires that the Federal Government is doing enough to prevent right now.

So I urge support of my amendment. Mr. RAHALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding. We accept the amendment on this side.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. HEINRICH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 111-52.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. HEINRICH:

Page 11, after line 4, insert the following new paragraph:

(6) A system to assess the impacts of climate change on the frequency and severity of wildland fire.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Thank you, Chairman RAHALL, for championing this legislation. I support the FLAME Act because it's critical to protecting the public safety of New Mexico's First Congressional District.

The forest fire season has begun earlier than ever in various areas of the Cibola National Forest in my congressional district, and specifically in the Mountainair Ranger District, where last year we saw the Trigo fire burn 14,000 acres over a period of a month. As you can imagine, being prepared for this year's fire season is a top priority for us.

The focus of this legislation is clearly the creation of a Catastrophic Wildfire Fund. But the bill also calls for a cohesive wildland fire management strategy. The amendment that I'm offering simply ensures that this strategy includes an assessment of the impacts of climate change on the frequency and severity of wildland fires.

Such an assessment is critical to our understanding of how the dynamics of fire seasons are dramatically affected due to changes in weather and temperature. Our forests are already experiencing climate change as we speak. I can see the effect on the forest when I hike through the Sandia Wilderness in my district. One of the primary consequences of these changes is the substantial increase in the forests' vulnerability to fire.

To put it simply, snow pack in our mountains is melting earlier in the season and at a much faster rate, resulting in dryer conditions earlier in the fire season on. This requires land managers to be prepared for fires much earlier than they have before, placing even more demands on the firefighters who make up our first line of defense.

In addition, warmer temperatures earlier in the year have allowed for more generations of insects like bark beetles to reproduce each summer. We've had serious bark beetle outbreaks in our Pinon and Ponderosa forests—and the damage that they do to trees contributes to significant deadwood on the forest floor, creating even more fuel for wildland fires.

Firefighters tell us that the conditions resulting from the bark beetle's impact create a different kind of fire—one that is more intense, more persistent, and more resistant to the tools that they have used to against them in the past.

□ 1045

This is why we must understand these trends resulting from our changing climate and the impact that they have on forest fire behavior. Moreover, forest fires have a compounding effect on climate change. Catastrophic forest fires release more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere than the carbon cycle can naturally process, which exacerbates the warming cycle and makes forests more vulnerable to fire.

Recognizing these changing conditions and being prepared to address them is essential to the safety of our firefighters and the communities that they risk their lives to protect. I strongly believe that my amendment will help every community threatened by wildfire to be better prepared for the fires that we will face in coming years.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico deals with what issues Federal agencies should take into account when preparing a cohesive wildland fire management strategy.

I will simply note the irony that Democrats on the Rules Committee made when they allowed this amendment to be made in order to require that the management strategy analyze how the world's atmosphere and climate might impact the frequency in severity of wildfires; and yet, my amendment to have the agencies include fire prevention practices on fire management was not made in order. Apparently, we prefer to dedicate our Federal firefighters' time to speculation about the weather and not on real on-the-ground, human-controlled actions that are proven to prevent fires from ever happening. So it seems to me our priorities, at least from the Rules Committee standpoint, might be a bit misplaced. But, nevertheless, this is a good amendment and we accept it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I want to thank him for his amendment, and we accept it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HEINRICH. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MINNICK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 111-52.

Mr. MINNICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with an amendment to H.R. 1404, the Federal Land Assistance Management and Enhancement Act.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. MINNICK: Page 7, after line 13, insert the following new paragraph:

(5) EFFECT OF INSECT INFESTATIONS.—For purposes of applying clauses (ii) and (iii) of paragraph (2)(A), the Secretaries shall take into account areas where insect infestation has created an extreme risk for wildfire.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. MINNICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. MINNICK. Mr. Chairman, our Nation's forests are in a state of crisis. In Idaho and throughout the West, the bark beetle is wreaking havoc on our healthy forests and increasing the risk and intensity of wildfires. The FLAME Act addresses the escalating costs of wildfires by creating a government fund for devastating emergency wildfires. My amendment addresses the growing problem that the bark beetle has on our forests.

This beetle is killing millions of trees out West, and the dead and dying trees they leave in their wake create the kind of fuel that can feed major wildfires and threaten our communities.

My amendment directs the allocation of funding in this Act to account for forest areas, not only in Idaho, but throughout the country, that have been greatly damaged by the infestation of invasive insects. Those areas have high potential to burn quickly, and must be managed in an effective way for the benefit and protection of local communities.

Mr. RAHALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINNICK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. I appreciate the gentleman's amendment, thank him for his work, and we accept the amendment.

Mr. MINNICK. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased the majority has acknowledged with this amendment the importance of prevention.

Whether the risk be beetle infestation or other disease, we can prevent

forest fires if we manage our forests. I hope in the future we can take genuine strides to prevent catastrophic fire. This amendment is just one small piece of a much broader prevention strategy that is needed.

If the gentleman is prepared to yield back, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MINNICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. MINNICK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MINNICK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. LUJÁN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 111-52.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. LUJÁN: Page 11, after line 4, insert the following new paragraph:

(6) A system to study the effects of invasive species on wildland fire risk.

Page 14, after line 7, insert the following new subparagraph:

(E) Implementation of fire-safety programs focused on the eradication or control of invasive species.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. RAHALL for his leadership on this issue.

All across New Mexico and the United States, wildfires are a growing hazard, posing a threat to life and property when woodland ecosystems meet developed areas.

In recent decades, invasive species have increased the wildfire threat to woodland ecosystems throughout the Southwest and other regions of the country. With my colleagues, Congresswoman MARKEY of Colorado and Congressman CONNOLLY of Virginia, I have proposed this amendment to limit fire risk resulting from the negative impacts of invasive species.

In my district, invasive species have become a problem. Increasing the threat of fire in woodland areas, several years of drought combined with high tree densities allowed pine bark beetle populations to reach outbreak levels between 2002 and 2004, killing

millions of pinyon and ponderosa pine trees in New Mexico and Arizona. Aerial survey data found that 3.4 million acres in the region were affected during that period. These dead trees have amplified the threat of fire in woodland areas by increasing the amount of dead and downed organic material, material that is just waiting for a spark.

This amendment will help decrease the threat of wildfires by identifying ways to reduce fire hazards through the study of invasive species and the increased fire vulnerability they cause.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, clearly invasive species have a role in destroying our valuable forests. My understanding is that the grants made available under this amendment would go towards programs focused on eradication of invasives.

Much like a weed infested, untended garden, our forests are being overtaken and destroyed. This condition is completely unnecessary, but our land managers now spend most of their time dealing with lawsuits, either preparing to be sued or being sued, while our forests go untreated. This is a good amendment, and I urge adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague.

This amendment adds a single element to section 3 of the FLAME Act, directing the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to develop a cohesive wildland fire management strategy.

As my colleague from New Mexico just indicated, invasive species really can be very destructive and, frankly, affect every part of the United States. For example, the gypsy moth defoliates and kills oak trees throughout the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic.

In my own region, the hemlock wooly adelgid has a similar range, but it infects and kills Eastern and Carolina hemlocks. Ninety percent of all of the hemlock trees in Virginia have been killed by this pest, and it is spreading, and it is spreading from the Southeast toward the Northeast and the Midwest. The southern pine beetle defoliates vast stands of pines in the South, wreaking havoc and creating tinderboxes in dry conditions.

The Forest Service recognizes these fire hazards. In 2002, in a report about the western bark beetle, the agency said that, "Extreme fuel loads pose a significant threat to property and life," and, "Mortality caused by bark beetles increases the risk of catastrophic fires."

This fire hazard is not limited to Western States. The Daniel Boone National Forest national managers, for example, said they "are concerned about the debris from dead and dying trees that are now covering the forest floor. This debris dramatically increases the fuel load in these areas, which may create severe conditions in the event of a wildfire."

Since invasive species can create conditions under which large fires are much more likely, it would be appropriate to try to prevent these hazardous fuels from accumulating by suppressing the pest in the first place.

I am delighted to join in this amendment. I thank my colleague from New Mexico and in advance my colleague from Colorado for joining in this effort, and I look forward to its adoption.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Mexico has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, I would yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlelady from Colorado, Congresswoman MARKEY.

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of an amendment to the FLAME Act that I coauthored along with Congressman LUJÁN and Congressman CONNOLLY.

Our amendment would provide for a management plan that would study the effects on wildfire risk. This amendment would also expand eligibility to allow grants to focus their fire prevention by eradicating invasive species. One such invasive species is tamarisk.

Since the 1960s, Westerners have worked to rid the region's rivers of tamarisk, hoping to salvage scarce water, protect wildlife, or fend off wildfire. Millions of dollars and countless back-breaking hours are spent each year on efforts to hack down and poison the plants.

Tamarisk has displaced native vegetation on approximately 1.6 million acres of land in the West and continues to spread. Studies have shown that mature tamarisk can uptake nearly 200 gallons of water a day. Due to this, the West is losing 2 million to 4.5 million acre-feet of water per year because of tamarisk. In Southeastern Colorado, this has made the land more arid, which has made it susceptible to wildfire. Our amendment will help suppress growth by eradicating the problem before it starts.

I want to thank my colleagues for working with me on this amendment, and I want to thank Chairman RAHALL for his support of our amendment and for his leadership on this bill. I urge all Members to support our amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, this is an important issue, and this issue needs to be dealt with in a manner that is timely and adequate. I urge passage of the amendment.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chair, thank you Mr. RAHALL for your leadership on this issue. All across New Mexico and the United States, wildfires are a growing hazard, posing a threat to life and property when woodland ecosystems meet developed areas. In recent decades, invasive species have increased the wildfire threat to woodland ecosystems throughout the southwest and other regions of the country. With my colleagues Congresswoman MARKEY of Colorado and Congressman CONNOLLY of Virginia, I have proposed this amendment to limit fire risk resulting from the negative impact of invasive species.

In my district, invasive species have become a problem—increasing the threat of fire in woodland areas. Several years of drought combined with high tree densities allowed pine bark beetle populations to reach outbreak levels between 2002 and 2004, killing millions of piñon and ponderosa pine trees in New Mexico and Arizona. Aerial survey data found that 3.4 million acres in the region were affected during this period.

These dead trees have amplified the threat of fire in woodland areas by increasing the amount of "dead and down" organic material—material that is just waiting for a spark. This amendment will help decrease the threat of wildfires by identifying ways to reduce fire hazards through the study of invasive species and the increased fire vulnerability they cause.

Mr. Chair, this is an important issue and an issue that is timely and adequate. With that Mr. Chair I urge the passage of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1100

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. RAHALL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 111-52.

Mr. RAHALL. On behalf of Mr. MATHESON of Utah, Mr. Chairman, I offer his amendment No. 10.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. RAHALL: Page 11, after line 4, insert the following new paragraph:

(6) A plan, developed in coordination with the National Guard Bureau, to maximize the use of National Guard resources to fight wildfires.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. This is a simple amendment, Mr. Chairman. It would allow the National Guard to participate in the fighting of wildfires.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. This amendment would direct better coordination of the National Guard with

wildfires. I think it is a good amendment, and we will accept it on this side.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield back.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MRS. KIRKPATRICK OF ARIZONA

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair has been notified that amendment No. 11 will not be offered.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 111-52.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona:

Page 11, line 25, strike "that—" and insert the following: "that satisfies the requirement of paragraph (1), and the requirements in at least two of the other four paragraphs, as follows:".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield to myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to the FLAME Act to amend the definition of "fire-ready community." The overall bill is of great concern to my district, where 6 million acres of national forest provide access to unique natural resources, but also pose a great risk of fire.

We are just a few short weeks from the official beginning of wildfire season in the State of Arizona. In fact, there was a report in the Prescott Daily Courier yesterday of a start of a wildfire in the Skull Valley area. For the next 6 months, more than 7,000 professional firefighters and countless volunteers will be on constant alert. We have already begun fighting fires just miles from the site of the Rodeo-Chediski fire that devastated Arizona's First District 7 years ago. And we expect to be tested throughout the district very soon.

The drought that has been ravaging Arizona for many years makes us even more vulnerable to wildfires than we once were. Just last year, in Yavapai County, which is in my district, we lost almost 9,000 acres and nearly lost the historic community of Crown King when a hiker started a small signal fire. And that was just one of the 1,850 wildfires that ranged over our State, burning 85,000 acres. And that was a mild wildfire season.

Our firefighters have bravely contained fires year in and year out doing

outstanding work to keep our citizens safe. They have risked their lives combating wildfires in Arizona and across the country. With some of the best training in the world available at the Wildfire Academy in Prescott, which was started with the efforts of my cousin, Cory Kirkpatrick, I have no doubt they will come into this wildfire season as well prepared as ever to protect our homes and communities.

But with the millions of acres of national forest for them to protect in the First District of Arizona alone and the State Forestry Division responsible for more than 22 million acres, bravery and readiness may not be enough. They need our assistance to partner with local communities for the implementation of a community wildfire protection plan, along with a provision for training, education and equipment.

That is why I have offered this amendment, which changes the definition of "fire-ready community," the cities and towns that will receive Fire-fighting Capability Grants. Under my amendment, cities that have taken good-faith steps to prepare for wildfire and are in regions considered high priority will be eligible for these grants.

With so much at stake, we should be making it easier for towns to receive the help they need to prepare and protect against devastating wildfires. To that end, I urge support of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I'm not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that this amendment makes it easier for communities to qualify for grants. These funds will be well spent if they actually go towards real fuel reduction. Neither taxpayers nor communities in harm's way of potential wildfires can afford to have funds used merely to nibble around the edges, avoiding tackling the real problem of fuel buildup.

This is a good amendment. I support it.

If the gentlelady is ready to close, I will yield back my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona and commend her on her excellent amendment and rise in support of it.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. I yield back my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 111-52.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. GOODLATTE:

Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 6. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE PARTNERSHIPS TO REDUCE HAZARDOUS FUELS ON NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LANDS TO PREVENT OR REDUCE THE SEVERITY OF WILDFIRES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONTRACT.—The term "contract" means any contracting authority available to the Secretary of Agriculture, including a sole source contract or other agreement for the mutual benefit of the Secretary and a State Forester.

(2) GOOD NEIGHBOR PROJECT.—The term "good neighbor project" means any project on National Forest System land that meets the requirements for hazardous fuels reduction projects under subsections (a), (d), (e), and (f) of section 102 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 6512).

(3) STATE FORESTER.—The term "State Forester" has the meaning given that term in section 4(k) of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103).

(b) PARTNERSHIP AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Agriculture (in this section referred to as the "Secretary") may enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with a State Forester to prepare and implement good neighbor projects on National Forest System land to complement any similar project being performed on bordering or adjacent non-Federal land. The decision to proceed with a good neighbor project is in the Secretary's sole discretion.

(c) STATE FORESTER OR EQUIVALENT OFFICIAL AS AGENT.—A cooperative agreement or contract under subsection (b) may authorize the State Forester to serve as the agent for the Secretary in providing all services necessary to facilitate the performance of good neighbor projects, except that any decision with respect to a good neighbor project required to be made under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) may not be delegated to a State Forester or any officer or employee of the State Forester.

(d) PROJECT REQUIREMENTS.—In implementing any good neighbor project, the Secretary shall ensure that—

(1) the project is consistent with the applicable land and resource management plan developed under section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604); and

(2) the project improves the cost efficiency of managing the National Forest System land covered by the project, as determined by the Secretary.

(e) PRIORITY FOR COLLABORATIVE PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall give priority to good neighbor projects that are—

(1) developed in collaboration with non-governmental entities;

(2) consistent with a community wildfire protection plan (as defined in section 101 of

the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6502)); or

(3) prepared in a manner consistent with the Implementation Plan for the Comprehensive Strategy for a Collaborative Approach for Reducing Wildland Fire Risks to Communities and the Environment, dated May 2002, developed pursuant to the conference report to accompany the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (House Report No. 106-64), and subsequent revisions of the implementation plan.

(f) RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.—Subsections (d) and (g) of section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a) shall not apply to a contract or other agreement under this subsection.

(g) SUBCONTRACTING BY A STATE FORESTER.—A State Forester may subcontract to the extent allowed by State and local law to prepare or implement a contract or other agreement under this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 281, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairman RAHALL for addressing this important issue over the last 2 years. The wildfire funding problems for the Forest Service are some of the most challenging issues the agency faces today. Wildfire funding costs have skyrocketed over the last decade and are consuming the Forest Service's budget, which means there is less funding for other Forest Service needs.

We will continue to see high costs and more damage to our forests and communities unless we take steps to reduce fire risk in our Federal forests. We must provide the Forest Service with additional tools to get our Federal forests in a healthy, more fire-resistant condition.

I support the underlying purpose of this legislation. However, the bill does not do enough to address the problem causing the increasing costs of fighting fires; that is, the unhealthy conditions of our forests.

My amendment to the FLAME Act will provide the Forest Service with an additional tool to address these problems that will ultimately leave our forests in a healthier condition and will yield a savings for the taxpayers.

My amendment creates a new contracting tool for the Forest Service to partner with States. This will give the Forest Service permanent authority to contract with States to reduce wildfire risks across boundary lines. This practice is commonly known as "good neighbor authority," and has been tested in States like Colorado and Utah, where it has proven to be effective. Currently, H.R. 1404 contains no such tool for the Forest Service.

The significance of this measure is that it will encourage both Federal and State agencies to work together to address unhealthy conditions in Federal forests. Fires know no boundaries.

They can start on Federal land and easily spread to State and private forestland. My amendment provides a more comprehensive approach to preventing dangerous fires and fighting them when they happen.

I'm pleased that my amendment has the support of several forestry groups, including the Society of American Foresters, the Council of State Foresters, the Forest Foundation and other forestry groups. I have also spoken with the Forest Service, and they have told me that they have no objections to this amendment.

Let me be clear. This amendment is meant to protect our forests from catastrophic fire. Like everyone else, I want to see our treasured national forests protected from fires. By allowing Federal and State agencies to work in tandem to reduce hazardous fuels, we are ensuring that our forests are protected for generations to come.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Goodlatte amendment. The amendment would provide expansive new contracting authority to State foresters to perform so called "good neighbor projects" on national forest system lands. My concern here is not with these types of projects in and of themselves, but rather the way the amendment would allow these type of projects to proceed.

In effect, the amendment represents an unwarranted authority which could undermine current protections in the law that protect taxpayer interests, forest worker rights and which ensure adequate environmental review for activities occurring on forest lands.

Some supporters of this proposal are seeking to use the pending legislation to make wholesale changes in Federal forest management. Specifically, the amendment would eliminate existing requirements on public notification and advertising of timber sales. It would eliminate requirements separating the planning of projects from those with a financial interest in the project.

The transfer of contracting authority from the Federal Government to the States also has impacts on Federal worker-protection laws. Under existing law, the Forest Service must ensure that contracts adhere to Federal labor standards. These contract labor laws provide fair wage rates and compensation for overtime.

These Federal labor standards do not apply to contracts issued by individual States. As such, wage standards and overtime requirements that are required for any Federal contract would

not apply under this amendment, since a State would be the contracting agent.

The Obama administration has highlighted the risk to the taxpayer of the reliance of Federal agencies on sole-source contracting, for which this amendment provides. A March 4 memorandum on government contracting states clearly that it is the policy of the Federal Government that executive agencies shall not engage in non-competitive contracts, except where appropriate safeguards have been put in place to protect the taxpayer. We have seen what happens when the government turns over contracting to a sole-source entity.

The underlying measure before the House today is about ensuring firefighters have the resources they need to combat wildfires. We have had our fire drills on forest management battles in the past.

□ 1115

This is not the time or place to have another.

I would note that this amendment is opposed by the AFL-CIO Building and Construction Trades. It's opposed by the Carpenters' Union as well. I have those communications in front of me.

And I would note that, while the gentleman from Virginia, as well-intentioned as he is in his efforts, and has noted that the Forest Service does not oppose the amendment, of course they don't. They cannot. And they are not for the amendment either. Of course they cannot be.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak in favor of this amendment.

This amendment simply gives the Secretary of Agriculture some flexibility to work in relationship with State directors to try and solve problems that exist.

In 2007, in my State of Utah, there was a half a million acres that were burned. Four-fifths of that was on Federal property. Unfortunately, fire, being stupid, didn't know enough to stop at the Federal line, and it actually did impinge on private property. There has been too much private property lost. There have been too many young lives that were lost in those fires. We need to have a solution to that.

The States of Colorado and Utah have been working on this program, and it has been effective. It's been effective in saving lives. It's been effective in saving property. It's been effective in alleviating the amount of fuel, the intensity of the fires and, over time, that simply helps our forest, it helps life, it helps the environment, it helps clean the air, and I thank the gentleman from Virginia for actually presenting this amendment. In Utah it

works. In Colorado it works. It can work in other places as well.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am the last speaker. I am ready to close on my side.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the ranking member, the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent opportunity, with this amendment, for us to insist that fire prevention activities be part of the overall wildland fire management equation. Mr. GOODLATTE's program to encourage cooperative management across Federal, State and private forest lands is, very simply, a positive step.

Wildfires do not read maps, and they do not respect boundaries. So by taking advantage of the non-Federal fuel reduction efforts, we can, in the long run, leverage more protection. And the one thing that this bill doesn't have enough of is protection. This is a positive step in that direction.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to quote from the building and construction trades letter to me in opposition to the pending amendment. They state their opposition to the Goodlatte amendment to H.R. 1404, the FLAME Act, because it will deprive employees of private contractors of Federal labor standards protection otherwise applicable to them while working on Federal land. The protective labor standards in the McNamara-O'Hare Service Contract Act and the Davis-Bacon Act, which would otherwise apply if these contracts are awarded by the U.S. Forest Service or the BLM, will not be applied to this work, even though it will be performed on national forest system land for the benefit of the Federal Government. For this reason, we urge the House to reject the Goodlatte amendment.

A similar telecommunication this morning to our office from the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America states that they are absolutely opposed to the Goodlatte amendment. Turning this work over to State governments deprives the workers on these projects of Federal labor law protections, and this is something we would never support.

That, again, is from the United Brotherhood of Carpenters. So, for these reasons and the reasons I stated in my previous statement, Mr. Chairman, I would urge our colleagues to reject this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to, again, encourage my colleagues to support this amendment. I say to the chairman of the committee, I appreciate the concerns that he has raised, but as has

been correctly noted, we are having ever-increasing problems with fighting forest fires each season. They do not recognize boundaries.

I think some of the labor concerns that the gentlemen have raised will actually work to the benefit of the groups that have raised these concerns because it is more likely that more work will be done by Federal-contracted employees under Federal rules on private and State lands if this kind of partnership and cooperation is allowed, than the reverse will be taking place.

Nonetheless, we should not wait while we work through all those things and force people to dance on the head of a pin, when we have the opportunity to work cooperatively right now among all those who are affected by forest fires.

We should enable a good neighbor policy to help fight forest fires. It will save the taxpayer dollars. It will make our forest healthier, it will allow us to move forward.

And finally, I'd say to the gentleman that yesterday he conveyed to us his willingness to continue to work on these issues regarding the health of the forest, and I take him at his word, and look forward to continuing to do that. But I think this amendment should be passed.

Mr. RAHALL. Yes, we will continue to work on these, I would respond to the gentleman from Virginia, work on these issues, including, as I said yesterday, preventive measures that are so necessary to getting at the root of the problem.

Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 111-52 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. PERLMUTTER of Colorado,

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington,

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. MINNICK of Idaho,

Amendment No. 12 by Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona,

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote of this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. PERLMUTTER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

AYES—420

Abercrombie	Cassidy	Gerlach
Ackerman	Castle	Giffords
Aderholt	Castor (FL)	Gingrey (GA)
Adler (NJ)	Chaffetz	Gohmert
Akin	Chandler	Gonzalez
Altmire	Childers	Goodlatte
Andrews	Christensen	Gordon (TN)
Arcuri	Clarke	Granger
Austria	Clay	Graves
Baca	Cleaver	Grayson
Bachmann	Clyburn	Green, Al
Bachus	Coble	Green, Gene
Baird	Coffman (CO)	Grijalva
Baldwin	Cohen	Guthrie
Barrett (SC)	Cole	Gutierrez
Barrow	Conaway	Hall (NY)
Bartlett	Connolly (VA)	Hall (TX)
Barton (TX)	Conyers	Halvorson
Bean	Cooper	Hare
Becerra	Costa	Harman
Berkley	Costello	Harper
Berman	Courtney	Hastings (FL)
Berry	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)
Biggert	Crowley	Heinrich
Bilbray	Cuellar	Heller
Bilirakis	Culberson	Hensarling
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Hерger
Bishop (NY)	Dahlkemper	Herseth Sandlin
Bishop (UT)	Davis (AL)	Higgins
Blackburn	Davis (IL)	Hill
Blumenauer	Davis (KY)	Himes
Blunt	DeFazio	Hinchee
Bocchieri	DeGette	Hirono
Boehner	Delahunt	Hodes
Bonner	DeLauro	Hoekstra
Bono Mack	Dent	Holden
Boozman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Holt
Bordallo	Diaz-Balart, M.	Honda
Boren	Dicks	Hunter
Boswell	Dingell	Inglis
Boucher	Doggett	Inslee
Boustany	Donnelly (IN)	Israel
Boyd	Dreier	Issa
Brady (PA)	Driehaus	Jackson (IL)
Brady (TX)	Duncan	Jackson-Lee
Braley (IA)	Edwards (MD)	(TX)
Bright	Edwards (TX)	Jenkins
Brown (GA)	Ehlers	Johnson (GA)
Brown (SC)	Ellison	Johnson (IL)
Brown, Corrine	Ellsworth	Johnson, E. B.
Brown-Waite,	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Ginny	Engel	Jones
Buchanan	Eshoo	Jordan (OH)
Burgess	Etheridge	Kagen
Burton (IN)	Fallin	Kanjorski
Butterfield	Farr	Kaptur
Buyer	Fattah	Kennedy
Calvert	Filner	Kildee
Camp	Flake	Kilpatrick (MI)
Campbell	Fleming	Kilroy
Cantor	Forbes	Kind
Cao	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Capito	Foster	King (NY)
Capps	Fox	Kingston
Capuano	Frank (MA)	Kirk
Cardoza	Franks (AZ)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Carnahan	Frelinghuysen	Kissell
Carney	Fudge	Klein (FL)
Carson (IN)	Gallegly	Kline (MN)
Carter	Garrett (NJ)	Kosmas

Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick

Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis (CO)
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)

Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skeltton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Alexander
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
Doyle
Faleomavaega

Griffith
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Linder
Miller, Gary
Murphy, Tim

Pascarell
Poe (TX)
Pomeroy
Sarbanes
Souder

□ 1148

Mrs. TAUSCHER changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

AYES—420

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Beceerra
Berman
Berry
Biggett
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver

Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cueellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare

Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hides
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Hoeckstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack

Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCauley
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne

Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis (CO)
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus

Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skeltton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Berkley
Blackburn
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
Doyle

Faleomavaega
Griffith
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Linder
Miller, Gary

Murphy, Tim
Pascarell
Poe (TX)
Pomeroy
Souder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. (during the vote). Two minutes remain in the vote.

□ 1156

Mr. KING of Iowa changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MINNICK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. MINNICK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 422, noes 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

AYES—422

Abercrombie	Cohen	Herseth Sandlin
Ackerman	Cole	Higgins
Aderholt	Conaway	Hill
Adler (NJ)	Connolly (VA)	Himes
Akin	Conyers	Hinchey
Alexander	Cooper	Hirono
Altmire	Costa	Hodes
Andrews	Costello	Hoekstra
Arcuri	Courtney	Holden
Austria	Crenshaw	Holt
Baca	Crowley	Honda
Bachmann	Cuellar	Hunter
Bachus	Culberson	Inglis
Baird	Cummings	Inslee
Baldwin	Dahlkemper	Israel
Barrett (SC)	Davis (AL)	Issa
Barrow	Davis (IL)	Jackson (IL)
Bartlett	Davis (KY)	Jackson-Lee
Barton (TX)	DeFazio	(TX)
Bean	DeGette	Jenkins
Becerra	Delahunt	Johnson (GA)
Berkley	DeLauro	Johnson (IL)
Berman	Dent	Johnson, E. B.
Berry	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson, Sam
Biggert	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jones
Bilbray	Dicks	Jordan (OH)
Bilirakis	Dingell	Kagen
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Kanjorski
Bishop (NY)	Donnelly (IN)	Kaptur
Bishop (UT)	Dreier	Kennedy
Blackburn	Drieheus	Kildee
Blumenauer	Duncan	Kilpatrick (MI)
Blunt	Edwards (MD)	Kilroy
Bocieri	Edwards (TX)	Kind
Boehner	Ehlers	King (IA)
Bonner	Ellison	King (NY)
Bono Mack	Ellsworth	Kingston
Boozman	Emerson	Kirk
Bordallo	Engel	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Boren	Eshoo	Kissell
Boswell	Etheridge	Klein (FL)
Boucher	Fallin	Kline (MN)
Boustany	Farr	Kosmas
Boyd	Fattah	Kratovil
Brady (PA)	Filner	Kucinich
Brady (TX)	Flake	Lamborn
Braley (IA)	Fleming	Lance
Bright	Forbes	Langevin
Brown (GA)	Fortenberry	Larsen (WA)
Brown (SC)	Foster	Larson (CT)
Brown, Corrine	Fox	Latham
Brown-Waite,	Frank (MA)	LaTourette
Ginny	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Lee (CA)
Burgess	Fudge	Lee (NY)
Burton (IN)	Gallely	Levin
Butterfield	Garrett (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Buyer	Gerlach	Lewis (GA)
Calvert	Giffords	Lipinski
Camp	Gingrey (GA)	LoBiondo
Campbell	Gohmert	Loebsack
Cantor	Gonzalez	Lofgren, Zoe
Cao	Goodlatte	Lowe
Capito	Gordon (TN)	Lucas
Capps	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Capuano	Graves	Lujan
Cardoza	Grayson	Lummis
Carnahan	Green, Al	Lungren, Daniel
Carney	Green, Gene	E.
Carson (IN)	Grijalva	Lynch
Carter	Guthrie	Mack
Cassidy	Gutierrez	Maffei
Castle	Hall (NY)	Maloney
Castor (FL)	Hall (TX)	Manzullo
Chaffetz	Halvorson	Marchant
Chandler	Hare	Markey (CO)
Childers	Harman	Markey (MA)
Christensen	Harper	Marshall
Clarke	Hastings (FL)	Massa
Clay	Hastings (WA)	Matheson
Cleaver	Heinrich	Matsui
Clyburn	Heller	McCarthy (CA)
Coble	Hensarling	McCarthy (NY)
Coffman (CO)	Herger	McCaul

McClintock	Platts	Slaughter
McCollum	Polis (CO)	Smith (NE)
McCotter	Posey	Smith (NJ)
McDermott	Price (GA)	Smith (TX)
McGovern	Price (NC)	Smith (WA)
McHenry	Putnam	Snyder
McHugh	Radanovich	Space
McIntyre	Rahall	Speier
McKeon	Rangel	Spratt
McMahon	Rehberg	Stark
McMorris	Reichert	Stearns
Rodgers	Reyes	Stupak
McNerney	Richardson	Sullivan
Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Sutton
Meeks (NY)	Roe (TN)	Tanner
Melancon	Rogers (AL)	Tauscher
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Taylor
Michaud	Rogers (MI)	Teague
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Terry
Miller (MI)	Rooney	Thompson (CA)
Miller (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (MS)
Miller, George	Roskam	Thompson (PA)
Minnick	Ross	Thornberry
Mitchell	Rothman (NJ)	Tiahrt
Mollohan	Roybal-Allard	Tiberi
Moore (KS)	Royce	Tierney
Moore (WI)	Ruppersberger	Titus
Moran (KS)	Rush	Tonko
Moran (VA)	Ryan (OH)	Towns
Murphy (CT)	Ryan (WI)	Tsongas
Murphy, Patrick	Sablan	Turner
Murtha	Salazar	Upton
Myrick	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Nadler (NY)	T.	Velázquez
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Neal (MA)	Sarbanes	Walden
Neugebauer	Scalise	Walz
Norton	Schakowsky	Wamp
Nunes	Schauer	Wasserman
Nye	Schiff	Schultz
Oberstar	Schmidt	Waters
Obey	Schock	Watson
Olson	Schrader	Watt
Oliver	Schwartz	Waxman
Ortiz	Scott (GA)	Weiner
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Welch
Pastor (AZ)	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland
Paul	Serrano	Wexler
Paulsen	Sessions	Whitfield
Payne	Sestak	Wilson (OH)
Pence	Shadegg	Wilson (SC)
Perlmutter	Shea-Porter	Wittman
Perriello	Sherman	Wolf
Peters	Shimkus	Woolsey
Peterson	Shuler	Wu
Petri	Shuster	Yarmuth
Pierluisi	Simpson	Young (AK)
Pingree (ME)	Sires	Young (FL)
Pitts	Skelton	

NOT VOTING—15

Davis (CA)	Griffith	Murphy, Tim
Davis (TN)	Hinojosa	Pascrell
Deal (GA)	Hoyer	Poe (TX)
Doyle	Linder	Pomeroy
Faleomavaega	Miller, Gary	Souder

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1204

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MRS.

KIRKPATRICK OF ARIZONA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 2, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

AYES—418

Abercrombie	Costello	Inslee
Ackerman	Courtney	Israel
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Jackson (IL)
Adler (NJ)	Crowley	Jackson-Lee
Akin	Cuellar	(TX)
Alexander	Culberson	Jenkins
Altmire	Cummings	Johnson (GA)
Andrews	Dahlkemper	Johnson (IL)
Arcuri	Davis (AL)	Johnson, E. B.
Austria	Davis (IL)	Johnson, Sam
Baca	Davis (KY)	Jones
Bachmann	DeFazio	Jordan (OH)
Bachus	DeGette	Kagen
Baird	Delahunt	Kanjorski
Baldwin	DeLauro	Kaptur
Barrett (SC)	Dent	Kennedy
Barrow	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kildee
Bartlett	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kilpatrick (MI)
Barton (TX)	Dicks	Kilroy
Bean	Dingell	Kind
Becerra	Doggett	King (IA)
Berkley	Donnelly (IN)	King (NY)
Berman	Dreier	Kingston
Berry	Drieheus	Kirk
Biggert	Duncan	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Bilbray	Edwards (MD)	Kissell
Bilirakis	Edwards (TX)	Klein (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Ehlers	Kline (MN)
Bishop (NY)	Ellison	Kosmas
Bishop (UT)	Ellsworth	Kratovil
Blackburn	Emerson	Lamborn
Blumenauer	Engel	Lance
Blunt	Eshoo	Langevin
Bocieri	Etheridge	Larsen (WA)
Boehner	Fallin	Larson (CT)
Bonner	Farr	Latham
Bono Mack	Fattah	LaTourette
Boozman	Filner	Latta
Bordallo	Flake	Lee (CA)
Boren	Fleming	Lee (NY)
Boswell	Forbes	Levin
Boucher	Fortenberry	Lewis (CA)
Boustany	Fox	Lewis (GA)
Boyd	Frank (MA)	Lipinski
Brady (PA)	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Brady (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	Loebsack
Braley (IA)	Gohmert	Lofgren, Zoe
Bright	Gonzalez	Lowe
Brown (GA)	Goodlatte	Lucas
Brown (SC)	Gordon (TN)	Luetkemeyer
Brown, Corrine	Granger	Lujan
Brown-Waite,	Graves	Lummis
Ginny	Grayson	Marchant
Buchanan	Green, Al	Markey (CO)
Burgess	Green, Gene	Markey (MA)
Burton (IN)	Grijalva	Marshall
Butterfield	Guthrie	Massa
Buyer	Gutierrez	Matheson
Calvert	Hall (NY)	Matsui
Camp	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (CA)
Campbell	Halvorson	McCarthy (NY)
Cantor	Hare	McCaul
Cao	Harman	McClintock
Capito	Harper	McCollum
Capps	Hastings (FL)	McCotter
Capuano	Hastings (WA)	McDermott
Cardoza	Heinrich	McGovern
Carnahan	Heller	McHenry
Carney	Hensarling	McHugh
Carson (IN)	Herger	McIntyre
Carter	Herseth Sandlin	McKeon
Cassidy	Higgins	McMahon
Castle	Hill	McMorris
Castor (FL)	Himes	Rodgers
Chaffetz	Hinchey	McNerney
Chandler	Hirono	Meek (FL)
Childers	Hodes	Meeks (NY)
Christensen	Hoekstra	Melancon
Clarke	Holden	Mica
Clay	Holt	Michaud
Cleaver	Honda	Miller (FL)
Clyburn	Hunter	Miller (MI)
Coble	Inglis	Miller (NC)
Coffman (CO)		

Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis (CO)
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez

Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space

Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—2

Issa Kucinich

NOT VOTING—17

Boren
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
Doyle
Faleomavaega

Griffith
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Linder
Miller, Gary
Murphy, Tim

Pascrell
Poe (TX)
Pomeroy
Souder
Welch

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1211

Mr. KUCINICH changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 148, noes 272, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

AYES—148

Aderholt
Akin
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Issa
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Dent
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry

Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon

McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Royce
Ruppersberger
Scalise
Schrader
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—272

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bocciari
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle

Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo

Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski

Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Mitchell
Mollohan

Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock

NOT VOTING—17

Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
Doyle
Faleomavaega
Griffith

Hinojosa
Hoyer
Linder
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Murphy, Tim

Pascrell
Poe (TX)
Pomeroy
Souder
Welch

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1219

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. POSEY and BRIGHT changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SIRE. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 161 I inadvertently miscast my vote. I intended to vote “no” on that question. I ask unanimous consent that this statement appear in the RECORD adjacent to that rollcall.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE) having assumed the chair, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1404) to authorize a supplemental funding source

for catastrophic emergency wildland fire suppression activities on Department of the Interior and National Forest System lands, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a cohesive wildland fire management strategy, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 281, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 412, noes 3, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

AYES—412

Abercrombie	Brown (GA)	Cummings
Ackerman	Brown (SC)	Dahlkemper
Aderholt	Brown, Corrine	Davis (AL)
Adler (NJ)	Brown-Waite,	Davis (IL)
Akin	Ginny	Davis (KY)
Alexander	Buchanan	DeFazio
Altmire	Burgess	DeGette
Andrews	Burton (IN)	Delahunt
Arcuri	Butterfield	DeLauro
Austria	Buyer	Dent
Baca	Calvert	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bachmann	Camp	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bachus	Campbell	Dicks
Baird	Cantor	Dingell
Baldwin	Cao	Doggett
Barrett (SC)	Capito	Donnelly (IN)
Barrow	Capps	Dreier
Bartlett	Capuano	Driehaus
Barton (TX)	Cardoza	Duncan
Bean	Carnahan	Edwards (MD)
Becerra	Carney	Edwards (TX)
Berkley	Carson (IN)	Ehlers
Berman	Carter	Ellison
Berry	Cassidy	Ellsworth
Biggert	Castle	Emerson
Bilbray	Chaffetz	Engel
Bilirakis	Chandler	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Childers	Etheridge
Bishop (NY)	Clarke	Fallin
Bishop (UT)	Clay	Farr
Blackburn	Cleaver	Fattah
Blumenauer	Clyburn	Filner
Blunt	Coble	Fleming
Bocieri	Coffman (CO)	Forbes
Boehner	Cohen	Fortenberry
Bonner	Cole	Foster
Bono Mack	Conaway	Fox
Boozman	Connolly (VA)	Frank (MA)
Boren	Conyers	Franks (AZ)
Boswell	Cooper	Frelinghuysen
Boucher	Costa	Fudge
Boustany	Costello	Gallegly
Boyd	Courtney	Garrett (NJ)
Brady (PA)	Crenshaw	Gerlach
Brady (TX)	Crowley	Giffords
Braley (IA)	Cuellar	Gingrey (GA)
Bright	Culberson	Gohmert

Gonzalez	Mack	Rothman (NJ)
Goodlatte	Maffei	Roybal-Allard
Gordon (TN)	Maloney	Royce
Granger	Manzullo	Ruppersberger
Graves	Marchant	Rush
Grayson	Markey (CO)	Ryan (OH)
Green, Al	Markey (MA)	Ryan (WI)
Green, Gene	Marshall	Salazar
Grijalva	Massa	Sánchez, Linda
Guthrie	Matheson	T.
Gutierrez	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta
Hall (NY)	McCarthy (CA)	Sarbanes
Hall (TX)	McCarthy (NY)	Scalise
Halvorson	McCaul	Schakowsky
Hare	McClintock	Schauer
Harman	McCollum	Schiff
Harper	McCotter	Schmidt
Hastings (FL)	McDermott	Schock
Hastings (WA)	McGovern	Schrader
Heinrich	McHenry	Schwartz
Heller	McHugh	Scott (GA)
Hensarling	McIntyre	Scott (VA)
Herger	McKeon	Serrano
Herseth Sandlin	McMahon	Sessions
Higgins	McMorris	Sestak
Hill	Rodgers	Shadegg
Himes	McNerney	Shea-Porter
Hinchey	Meek (FL)	Sherman
Hirono	Meeks (NY)	Shimkus
Hodes	Melancon	Shuler
Hoekstra	Mica	Shuster
Holden	Michaud	Simpson
Holt	Miller (FL)	Sires
Honda	Miller (MI)	Skelton
Hunter	Miller (NC)	Slaughter
Inglis	Miller, George	Smith (NE)
Inslee	Minnick	Smith (NJ)
Israel	Mitchell	Smith (TX)
Issa	Mollohan	Snyder
Jackson (IL)	Moore (KS)	Space
Jackson-Lee	Moore (WI)	Speier
(TX)	Moran (KS)	Spratt
Jenkins	Moran (VA)	Stark
Johnson (GA)	Murphy (CT)	Stearns
Johnson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick	Stupak
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	Sullivan
Johnson, Sam	Myrick	Sutton
Jones	Nadler (NY)	Tanner
Jordan (OH)	Napolitano	Tauscher
Kagen	Neal (MA)	Taylor
Kanjorski	Neugebauer	Teague
Kaptur	Nunes	Terry
Kennedy	Nye	Thompson (CA)
Kildee	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
Kilpatrick (MI)	Obey	Thompson (PA)
Kilroy	Olson	Thornberry
Kind	Olver	Tiahrt
King (IA)	Ortiz	Tiberi
King (NY)	Pallone	Tierney
Kingston	Pastor (AZ)	Titus
Kirk	Paulsen	Tonko
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Payne	Towns
Kissell	Pence	Tsongas
Klein (FL)	Perlmutter	Turner
Kline (MN)	Perriello	Upton
Klone	Peters	Van Hollen
Kratovil	Peterson	Velázquez
Kucinich	Petri	Visclosky
Lamborn	Pingree (ME)	Walden
Lance	Pitts	Walz
Langevin	Platts	Wamp
Larsen (WA)	Polis (CO)	Wasserman
Larson (CT)	Posey	Schultz
Latham	Price (GA)	Waters
LaTourette	Price (NC)	Putnam
Latta	Putnam	Watson
Lee (CA)	Radanovich	Watt
Lee (NY)	Rahall	Waxman
Levin	Rangel	Weiner
Lewis (CA)	Rehberg	Welch
Lewis (GA)	Reichert	Westmoreland
Lipinski	Reyes	Wexler
LoBiondo	Richardson	Whitfield
Loebach	Rodriguez	Wilson (OH)
Lofgren, Zoe	Roe (TN)	Wilson (SC)
Lowe	Rogers (AL)	Wittman
Lucas	Rogers (KY)	Wolf
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (MI)	Woolsey
Luján	Rohrabacher	Wu
Lummis	Rooney	Yarmuth
Lungren, Daniel	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
E.	Roskam	Young (FL)
Lynch	Ross	

NOES—3

Flake	Paul	Sensenbrenner
-------	------	---------------

NOT VOTING—16

Castor (FL)	Hinojosa	Poe (TX)
Davis (CA)	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Davis (TN)	Linder	Smith (WA)
Deal (GA)	Miller, Gary	Souder
Doyle	Murphy, Tim	
Griffith	Pascarell	

□ 1237

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes No. 157 through 162, I was on a leave of absence due to the funeral of a very close friend.

Had I been present for rollcall vote No. 157 on the Perlmutter amendment to H.R. 1404, to clarify that authorized suppression activities for the Flame Fund include containment activities in response to crisis insect infestations to reduce the likelihood of wildfires, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall vote No. 158 on the Hastings amendment to H.R. 1404, to require advance notice, in writing, to adjacent landowners whenever the Department of Agriculture sets a prescribed fire on National Forest System land, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall vote No. 159 on the Minnick amendment to H.R. 1404, to require that the Secretaries, in considering severity of and threat posed by a fire for the purposes of determining whether to declare that a wildland fire suppression activity is eligible for funding from the flame Fund, take into account areas where insect infestation has created an extreme risk for wildfire, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall vote No. 160 on the Kirkpatrick amendment to H.R. 1404, to amend the definition of "fire-ready community" in the bill to provide that a community satisfies the definition if it is located within a priority area identified by the fire risk maps required by the bill, and meets two of the other four criteria listed in the bill for "fire-ready communities," I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall vote No. 161 on the Goodlatte amendment to H.R. 1404, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into sole source contracts with States to prepare and implement "good neighbor" projects on National Forest System lands, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for rollcall vote No. 162 on final passage of H.R. 1404, the Federal Land Assistance, Management and Enhancement Act, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the RECORD that today, March 26th, I was detained in my district and therefore missed the six rollcall votes of the day. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote No. 157 on agreeing to the Perlmutter of Colorado Amendment. Had I been present I would have also voted "aye" on rollcall vote No. 158 on agreeing to the Hastings of Washington Amendment No. 4. Had I been present I would have also voted "aye" on rollcall vote No. 159 on agreeing to

the Minnick of Idaho Amendment. Had I been present I would have also voted "aye" on rollcall vote No. 160 on agreeing to the Kirkpatrick of Arizona Amendment. Had I been present I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote No. 161 on agreeing to the Goodlatte of Virginia Amendment. Lastly, had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 161 on final passage of the Federal Land Assistance, Management and Enhancement Act.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1404, FEDERAL LAND ASSISTANCE, MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 1404, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1135

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor to H.R. 1135.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1319

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1319. My name was mistakenly submitted by the bill's sponsors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1427

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1427. My name was added as a result of an administrative error.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. CANTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York for the purposes of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, we will consider Senate amendments to H.R. 1388, Generations Invigorating Volunteerism and Education Act; H.R. 1664, Pay for Performance Act; and the fiscal year 2010 budget resolution.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if the House will begin the process of deliberating on the budget on Wednesday. Is that the planned day that we will have the discussion on the budget here on the floor; and, does he expect that debate to stretch over 2 days? And, again, if he could elaborate as to when the final vote on the budget is expected.

Mr. CROWLEY. If the gentleman would continue to yield.

I haven't spoken to the majority leader about the specifics in terms of the schedule. The intention is to finish a vote on the budget by the end of business next week.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the further question. Does he anticipate a weekend session possibility?

Mr. CROWLEY. There is always the possibility that if we fail to resolve or come to agreement on the budget by the time we hope to before the close of business day next week, that we possibly could work into the weekend to pass that budget.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, further, I would ask the gentleman if he could tell us about the expected process of amendments, of substitutes.

How many substitutes should we expect your side to offer? Will the Blue Dogs have a substitute? Does this budget replace the budget of the Progressive Caucus that we usually see come to the floor? Will they have a need for a substitute? Just trying to get some idea, Mr. Speaker.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have not spoken, again, to the majority leader about this specifically or to the Rules Committee chairwoman about this. I do not know at this time how many substitutes we expect to make in order. Does the gentleman know how many on his side we can expect to be submitted?

I do expect that we will complete the consideration of vote on the budget

resolution next week, and that the leadership intends to be here until we can accomplish that objective. And, yes, again, that could mean extending into the weekend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

And I could very easily tell him we will have one substitute from the minority side of the aisle, which is why I am asking how many we could expect from yours.

Mr. CROWLEY. Again, I don't have an answer for you.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would reclaim my time.

I would ask the gentleman from New York, in reference to the D.C. voting bill, what are the latest plans for floor consideration on that? And, will a second amendment protection be added to that bill? I yield.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I know this is a priority for the leadership, and we continue to work on that. However, I do not expect it will be ready for the floor next week, nor do I know whether or not there will be a second amendment application in that bill as well.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I would ask again, are we to expect a vote on D.C. voting next week as well?

Mr. CROWLEY. As I just stated, I do not expect it will be ready for the floor next week.

Mr. CANTOR. I apologize to the gentleman; I didn't quite discern that. I thank the gentleman.

I would ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, about the FDA bill and the regulation of tobacco. And does he expect this bill to come to the floor next week? And in what form does he expect this bill to come, under a rule or as a suspension?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman will recall, this bill passed the House 326-102, with 96 Republicans voting "yes." The bill does have broad bipartisan support. We continue to work with Chairman WAXMAN to have this bill ready for the floor. I have not, again, spoken to the chairwoman of the Rules Committee yet as to how this bill will be brought to the floor. And it could be as early as next week, although we have no confirmation of that yet.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

□ 1245

Mr. BUYER. I would ask of the gentleman, representing the views of the minority leadership of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the House Armed Services Committee, that there are some outstanding issues and that the dynamic has, in fact, changed, that there are bipartisan alternatives to Mr. WAXMAN's legislation. And so what we are asking is for there to be regular order for the House to be able to work its will.

This bipartisan legislation is a completely different type of alternative approach to public health policy with tobacco. So while the gentleman was active with regard to what occurred in the last Congress, this is a very different Congress. So we are asking for regular order.

And there is a particular issue that is highly sensitive to the House Armed Services Committee because the Waxman legislation mandates the inclusion of the military in the Roth program. So what we have is, the Energy and Commerce Committee is dictating military personnel policy. In order to protect this about 160 million over a 10-year, for that to remain in the personnel budget of the Armed Services Committee, the Armed Services Committee would need to have an amendment that goes through the Rules Committee. You see, if, in fact, you allow it to come on suspension, the suspension then denies the House Armed Services Committee's ability to fence off those dollars for it to remain in the personnel budget. It would also deny the bipartisan substitute and would also deny Dr. BURGESS his amendments.

So the dynamic, I just want to inform the majority, has changed. And we are very hopeful that you will take that under advisement and that that bill will be brought to the floor under a rule.

Mr. CANTOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Thank you for yielding.

I appreciate Mr. BUYER's work and efforts on this legislation. I do know there are multiple jurisdictions on this. And it is my understanding that the chairs of the requisite committees are continuing to discuss the legislation. And again, it is a priority for Mr. WAXMAN, and we hope to have it on the floor, and they are hoping to work through some of these issues.

Mr. CANTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BUYER. We have been working very hard. And I would place the majority on notice that please do not bring this on suspension, because we have the votes to bring it down.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York about the schedule past the Easter recess and what we can expect to come to the floor following our return from recess.

Mr. CROWLEY. The agenda for the next work period, I have not, again, spoken directly with the majority leader about the schedule after recess. But I would expect we will be working on a budget conference report after the Senate and House will have worked their will next week, in addition to some of the other items you have mentioned, including a D.C. vote as well as stem-cell legislation.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to ask the gentleman in reference to the budget that will be

considered next week, that we now have a text of the bill out of committee, and the fact that really some of the implications of that bill still remain very unclear. Specifically, I would like to ask about the cap-and-trade scheme that seems to be continuing to circulate in the discussions in committee as well as publicly in the press, and whether the reconciliation instructions in the bill that came out of the Budget Committee refers to that, and whether we are going to be considering the impact of that scheme on the working families of this country, as they are having a difficult time as it is, as the gentleman knows, in his area, in particular, as it is hard-hit as the center of the financial world. Are our families going to have to expect that somehow the reconciliation tools will be used to impose a national energy tax that some have estimated will cost the average family \$3,000 a year?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and his observations about my district as well. The gentleman makes reference to cap-and-trade as we know it on this side of the aisle.

The budget resolution does not provide reconciliation instructions for cap and trade. And it is not our intention to use reconciliation in terms of the process for that legislation. However, it does provide for legislation encouraging alternative energy sources and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, which we intend to move through legislative process.

In addition, we have heard repeatedly the minority's concern about the cost of the cap-and-trade proposal. You just reiterated some of those concerns. Again, the budget does not proscribe the contents of cap-and-trade legislation, which we have left to the relevant committees, including the committee that you and I both serve on, where a hearing at this very moment on cap and trade is taking place. At this point, both those estimates make certain assumptions about a bill that is, in effect, not yet written.

We look forward to working with the minority, I personally with you, to address the costs of cap-and-trade legislation as it moves forward.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I asked the whip to yield to me so I may inquire of the designee of the majority leader. Today, the House Financial Services Committee by a vote of 64-0 reported H. Res. 251. And as the gentleman is aware, the AIG bonus issue is something that has roiled both parties. Both parties are embarrassed that somebody slipped a paragraph into the stimulus bill. H. Res. 251 is a resolution of inquiry that directs the Secretary of the Treasury to provide not only the documents that he might have

in his possession, but they also relate back to Secretary Paulson and his administration of the TARP program. So it clearly is a bipartisan measure. I think the vote of 64-0 speaks for itself.

And I note that on next week's schedule the majority has scheduled the other bill that was just reported this morning out of the Financial Services Committee, and I would ask the gentleman if we are going to see H. Res. 251 next week. And if not, I would make my request that we do. And I would further make the request that since the vote was 64-0 and we appear to have run out of post offices, perhaps it could be a suspension next week.

Mr. CANTOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I haven't spoken to Chairman FRANK about the legislation. I don't expect at this point that it would be on the suspension calendar or on the calendar for next week. Again, that does mean it will not be. I just simply have not had that conversation to affirm or negate that.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

At this time, I would like to again reiterate my thanks to the gentleman from New York, and I yield back.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 30, 2009

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-57) on the resolution (H. Res. 289) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

VILLA MARIA ACADEMY BASKETBALL TEAM

(Mrs. DAHLKEMPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my alma mater, the Villa Maria Academy Girls' Basketball Team, or should I say the 2009 Pennsylvania AA State Champions.

Last Friday, Erie, Pennsylvania's Villa Maria Victors defeated three-time defending champs, York Catholic, by 56-51, winning the State championship for the first time in school history.

Displaying great team spirit, Villa Maria built a large 18-point lead in the second half before fighting off a late York Catholic charge.

Established in 1892 by the Sisters of St. Joseph of Northwestern Pennsylvania, the Villa Maria Academy is a Catholic coeducational secondary school. And for over 115 years, Villa Maria Academy has been a part of the history and tradition of the Erie area, providing educational excellence for area students in preparation for higher education and life pursuits.

The mission of the academy is to empower young people to recognize their uniqueness and talents. The Villa Maria Academy Girls' Basketball Team demonstrated that commitment to excellence last Friday.

Congratulations to the new 2009 Pennsylvania AA State Champions.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

OBAMA TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the worst things that you can do during an economic downturn is to raise taxes. And Speaker PELOSI and the Democrats' budget does exactly that.

The amount of taxes that they anticipate raising in their budget, which we are going to debate next week, is \$1.4 trillion. One point four trillion dollars. And the majority of the burden of this tax increase is on a number of different areas of government. One of those is a \$637 billion tax increase that is going to be borne by small businesses that pay taxes as individuals. Small businesses create about 60 to 80 percent of all the new jobs in America, and these new taxes will be a real wet blanket on job creation and economic growth right in the middle of this recession.

They are also going to tax everybody in this country with the energy tax that they are going to add. The budget proposes to raise taxes by \$646 billion

on consumers of oil, coal and natural gas through a complicated cap-and-tax program that will increase the cost of energy for every American. If you turn on your light switch, if you use gas in your car, if you use gas to heat your home, any kind of energy that you use is going to be taxed. And that is going to amount to, on average, \$3,128 in new taxes on every family in America.

Also under the Speaker's budget, taxes on capital gains and dividends will increase from 15 to 20 percent, increasing taxes on investors by \$338 billion over 10 years. These taxes would directly affect investors and stockholders, including people who have 401(k) programs and pension funds, mostly impacted by the declining stock market, and would further discourage investments during a time when new investments are absolutely essential to jump-start our economy.

They are also going to tax charitable giving. They are going to reduce the amount of money that people can deduct from their taxes when they give money to charities. And the charities of this country indicate that is going to cost them at least \$4 to \$9 billion. Now, if the charities in this country can't spend that \$4 to \$9 billion that is given to them by the people of this country, then where are they going to get the money?

Where are the people of this country going to get the money to solve these problems? It is going to probably end up on the back of the taxpayers.

And then we have what is called the "death tax" that they are reinstating. And that says that everybody that has a business, if you want to pass it on to your relatives or your children or grandchildren when you die, there is going to be a tax on it. They are going to tax it and tax it and tax it so that the value of the property or the investment will go down dramatically. And many of the people who would inherit a business so that they can carry on, a farmer, an agricultural family, they will lose it because they can't pay the taxes.

And then they are also going to tax investors, Part 2 investors. The budget would more than double the taxes on carried interest, increasing taxes up from the capital gains rate of 15 percent to the income tax rate of 35 percent.

And all I can say to my colleagues is that the Speaker and the Democrat proposal needs to be re-evaluated. At a time when this economy is suffering, we need to have tax cuts, tax incentives for new job creation, and tax cuts that will allow Americans to take more of their pay home that they can spend on things like refrigerators, cars, food and clothing.

□ 1300

And what they're going to do is they're going to tax, tax, tax, which is going to be another wet blanket on the economy.

One of the great things, one of the things that really hurt this country

during the Great Depression in the twenties and thirties, was because they raised taxes. That's exactly the wrong thing to do. After Jimmy Carter put us in this trick bag with 14 percent unemployment, or 14 percent inflation and 12 percent unemployment, Ronald Reagan came in and cut taxes across the board, and that increased the productivity in this country. People had more disposable income, and the economy flourished, and we had a period of unprecedented economic growth. That's what we should be doing now, not raising taxes, not adding to the deficit by having these huge budgetary expenditures that are in Speaker PELOSI and the Democrats' plan.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that everybody will listen to what was just said because we don't need tax increases and more spending right now.

WE MUST NOT REPEAT THE MISTAKES OF THE PAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, the Obama administration is finalizing its strategy for Afghanistan, and it may announce the results of its war review in the next few days.

President Obama inherited the situation in Afghanistan. He is a leader who prefers diplomacy over war. The United States is organizing an international conference on Afghanistan to reach out to the international community for their help. And there is talk about sending a civilian surge, a surge of experts in such areas as agriculture, reconstruction, rebuilding, and education to Afghanistan, all very positive steps.

Since President Obama, however, has said that he will send at least 17,000 more troops to Afghanistan and possibly more, I am deeply concerned. It will take years, and it will take a lot of blood and treasure to fight a war in Afghanistan and Pakistan. It could bog us down and distract us from our enormous domestic problems right here at home. It could cost us lives. It would cost us economic treasure, and it would cost us, actually it would leave our reputation, international reputation in tatters.

Our 6-year occupation of Iraq, which continues, as I speak, has been a disaster that we absolutely must learn from. Using military force to solve problems that don't have a military solution doesn't work. Foreign occupation doesn't work. According to a new Army report, there are still over 100 attacks per week on our troops in Iraq.

Another occupation, Madam Speaker, halfway around the world, raises serious questions that Congress needs an answer to. So last month, I joined my colleagues, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, and since we wrote a particular letter to the President and sent it, 10

other Members have signed on, and we're going to send that letter on to him also, raising these issues.

We and the others made six recommendations. These recommendations are:

1. Ask Congress for a clear authorization for the use for military force in Afghanistan and Pakistan;

2. Define the goals objectives and benefits of U.S. involvement in Afghanistan;

3. Determine the human and financial resources needed to carry out our efforts;

4. Develop a timeline for the redeployment of our troops and military contractors out of Afghanistan;

5. Clearly describe the role of NATO, the United Nations and other international partners;

6. And finally, meet the immediate humanitarian and economic needs of the Afghan people.

Madam Speaker, these six steps offer a good blueprint for avoiding a repeat of the mistakes that the United States made in Iraq. We need nation building, not empire building, because the way to defeat our enemies is to help the Afghan people to rebuild their country and to give them hope for a better future. Schools and roads will win us more hearts and minds than bombs and bullets.

And a new foreign policy, based on conflict resolution and humanitarian assistance, is the most responsible and smartest way for us to achieve our goals in the Middle East and Central Asia. I hope that President Obama's new plan for Afghanistan will reflect this strategy and these values, because if we don't learn from our Iraq experience, we are doomed to repeat it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

26TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EGYPTIAN-ISRAELI PEACE TREATY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, today I wish to acknowledge and express deep gratitude to timeless leaders President Jimmy Carter, Egyptian President Anwar al-Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin for their historic, unprecedented and courageous journey toward peace in the Middle

East three decades ago today. March 26 marks the anniversary of their signing of the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty, momentous in that it was the first such treaty between an Arab nation and the nation of Israel. It followed the Camp David Accords which these leaders had signed the prior year. They signed it right here on the White House lawn.

I can remember the day. History will record for all time that incredible step forward of lions and lambs lying down their arms and their fears. I can still recall the day of that signing. It was a sunny day, as the three leaders pledged their political and personal capital to that unprecedented feat. It was historic. It was bold. And it was costly. In 1981, an assassin in Cairo would take the life of President Anwar al-Sadat. In 1983, Menachem Begin resigned. President Jimmy Carter lost his re-election campaign.

President Jimmy Carter and his gifted National Security adviser, Zbigniew Brezezinski, carry the collective living memory of that pristine moment of the Camp David Peace Accord and the Egyptian Israeli Peace Treaty. To date, only one other Arab nation has signed a peace accord with the nation of Israel, Jordan, in 1994, well over 10 years later, through the equally courageous vision of its timeless leader, King Hussein.

Looking back, as today's upheaval across the Middle East reminds us of old fractures and unmet potential, we can ask, how did these men do it? How did they make history?

The enmity between people and nations was no less. The prospects forward seemed very dim at that time. Yet, their inspired and dogged efforts did not take no for an answer. That peace agreement ended 30 years of war between Israel and Egypt. Now we have seen 30 years of peace between them. By anyone's measure, this remains the most important set of diplomatic achievements in the Middle East in modern history. We need to celebrate them.

And as we honor the achievement of these leaders, and the nations to which they dedicated their lives, let us remember what they did.

President Jimmy Carter stated, "War may sometimes be a necessary evil. But no matter how necessary, it is always an evil, never a good. We will not learn how to live together in peace by killing each others' children."

Prime Minister Menachem Begin said, "If through your efforts and sacrifice, you win liberty and with it the prospect of peace, then work for peace because there is no mission in life more sacred."

And President Anwar al-Sadat said, "Peace is much more precious than a piece of land."

Could we only recapture that moment again. How much our world still owes these men for leading history forward, for showing us the way. They did not allow the status quo or entrenched

rivalries and worn-out dreams to quash the prospect of peace. They gave their all to it. Today, we commemorate and we celebrate their greatness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. COHEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOHMERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHERMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

OUR CHILDREN AND GRANDCHILDREN'S FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to come here today with some of my colleagues to talk about several issues that we think are of very much concern to the American people. Whatever we do here in terms of spending, we know has a major impact on our country. And it's not just for today that it has an impact but it's for a long, long time. And so we are highlighting today what is happening with the budget that has been made public today and that's going to be debated next week, and probably adopted, unfortunately, unfortunately for the American people and for our children and our grandchildren, maybe even our great grandchildren. So we'll be talking about that for the next hour.

And I'm joined by two of my colleagues that I want to yield some time

to to ask them to make some presentations on some particular issues they are very familiar with and do a wonderful job of explaining. So I'd like to yield now to my colleague from Georgia, the distinguished physician, Mr. GINGREY.

□ 1315

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding.

As she was pointing out, next week, the budget—the House version of our budget for fiscal year 2010—will be on this floor, and I think there is the full intention for that budget to be voted on and passed this coming week. Those of us who do not sit on the Budget Committee are not sure of all of the fine details in that budget, but we do know what our President has proffered to the Congress and to the American people as to what he would like to see as the Office of Management and Budget develops this \$3.6 trillion budget. I think this is the highest amount of spending that we have had in this country since we originated our country way back in 1776 and 1779.

The bottom line in regard to it is really simple as we look at it, as we, the loyal minority—the Republican party—look at that budget. There is no question but that it does three things: It spends enormously; it taxes painfully, and it borrows dangerously. Said another way, President Obama's budget spends too much; it taxes too much, and it borrows too much. We feel that that is wrong. As I talk today with my colleague VIRGINIA FOXX, I think it is important that people understand that there is a better way.

According to Republican philosophy, it has always been our feeling—and I think this is a major difference between the Republicans and the Democrats—that we think “less government.” We think people have an opportunity to hold onto more of their hard-earned dollars and to pay less taxes to the Federal Government and to limit spending. That is the best recipe to get us out of this economic ditch that we are in. You have heard, and I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle many times say, “The first rule of a ditch is that, when you're in one, you need to stop digging.” Well, without question, this budget that the President has submitted to us is just digging a deeper and deeper hole in regard to the amount of debt—well, deficit spending, red ink—from year to year. In the aggregate, of course, you accumulate more and more debt, and you have to pay interest on that debt. It is just something that we, in our lifetimes, will never pay back. Our grandchildren will never pay it back, but our great grandchildren—maybe they will pay it back, but what a burden, what a legacy to leave to the next generations.

So I thank the gentlewoman. I am really happy to be sharing the time with her and with my other colleagues.

I will yield back to Ms. FOXX, and we will continue to discuss some of the finer points of this budget that we are going to be voting on next week.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for setting the stage for this and for reiterating what we, as Republicans, believe so strongly in—that the President's budget spends too much, taxes too much and borrows too much.

Well, what we know now is that the budget presented by the Democrats in the meetings in the Budget Committee yesterday is basically the same. They kept trying to say their budget was going to be different from the President's. They have heard the firestorm. The American people are beginning to wake up. They realize that some things that were said to them in last year's election are not turning out the way they thought they were going to turn out, and they are getting a little spooked by that, so they've been trying to backpedal from that. They were saying there is going to be less spending, smaller deficits, lower debt, but in the meeting yesterday, during the markup, we know now that the two budgets are really the same. Here are some of their comments that prove that. We don't have to say it. We just use their own words:

“This budget resolution shares the President's priorities.”

“This is a key step to making the President's plan a reality.”

“The President has proposed, and under this budget, we support his plans.”

The chairman's mark “embraces and supports the President's budget.”

These remarks admitted the obvious. The mark could be described as different only if one believed the following: that the 5-year budget window as opposed to the President's 10-year plan is not designed to hide the explosion of cost after 2014 for the President's ambitious, big-government agenda; that the Alternative Minimum Tax will be fixed in a deficit neutral fashion—that is, by raising other taxes, though the Democrats, themselves, have rejected this approach for the past 2 years; that Making Work Pay Tax Credit, a key provision in the President's budget, will not be extended unless offset, and it was created as an emergency; that the Troubled Asset Relief Program, the TARP, is over, and the Treasury Secretary's financial stabilization plan will get no more funding; and that the mark's numerous reserve funds, also known as tax-and-spend, will not be used to increase spending and taxes in the President's plan for a sweeping expansion of government.

So we know now that the Democrat budget, presented by the Democrat leadership, is the same as the Obama budget, so we will go on to show why we think this budget is not the right thing to do.

Before we spend more time on that, I want to give some time to my col-

league from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), who has an excellent presentation to show how we are getting into the messes that we are getting into as a result of the action of the majority. I know there are still some people out there who don't understand that this Congress is controlled by the Democrats. It has been controlled by the Democrats since January of 2007, and while they keep talking about what they have inherited, they have to own up to the responsibility at some point.

I yield now such time as he may consume to my wonderful colleague from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

(Mr. LATOURETTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATOURETTE. Well, I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina.

You know, I think the gentlelady from North Carolina and the gentleman from Georgia have correctly hit on the fact—and I think anyone who realistically looks at the budget that we are going to be asked to pass judgment on next week—spends too much, taxes too much and borrows too much from future generations, but of as much concern or maybe of more concern to me is, basically, that there are things occurring in this House that I never thought would occur.

This is my 15th year in the United States Congress. I am proud to represent my corner of Ohio. There is this notion that we can rush legislation through without reading it and without knowing what is in it. Especially on our side—and I will talk about the stimulus bill in a minute—we got about 90 minutes to read 1,000 pages, 1,000 pages in the stimulus bill. They gave us 90 minutes to read it, and then people are surprised when funny things happen. The funny thing I want to just mention and why I hope we don't go down this road with the budget that spends too much, taxes too much and borrows too much is what happened in the stimulus bill.

So, again, this was put forward as “we have to get it done.” We had to get it done by the President's Day recess for some reason. I don't know what the reason was, but we had to get it done and get it done in a hurry. On the Tuesday of the week that we considered the stimulus bill, we had a vote here in this Chamber. The proposition was—and it was a silly proposition—before we would be asked to vote on the stimulus bill, every Member would be given 48 hours to read the bill, and it would be posted on the Internet so our constituents and anybody who was interested could also read the bill and could have 48 hours to sort of digest it. Everybody voted. Everybody who was here that day voted to do that—every Republican and every Democrat.

Well, then we came along to Friday, and the bill was filed at a little after midnight on Thursday night. I apologize that I wasn't up to receive the 1,000 pages to read it then, but when I did get into the office, there were 90

minutes to read 1,000 pages between the time I got to work and the time that we had the vote. That was the length of the debate.

People said, "Well, don't worry about it, you know. It's only 1,000 pages. It only spends \$1 trillion. Why would you want to read the thing?" Well, sadly—and we warned—what happens when you do things like that is that people get embarrassed, and in fact, people did get embarrassed.

Some folks may remember that, for the last couple of weeks, people have been upset about these million-dollar bonuses, these multi-million-dollar bonuses, included in the bill, that went to executives at a company called AIG, which many point a finger to as at least participating in the economic decline that we, sadly, are experiencing.

When the stimulus bill was considered in the United States Senate, across the Rotunda on the other side, two Senators—a Democratic Senator by the name of WYDEN from Oregon and a Republican Senator by the name of SNOWE from Maine—authored an amendment that went into the stimulus bill that said—and it was pretty simple—that if you are a firm that is getting billions of taxpayer dollars, do not give million-dollar bonuses to your executives. I mean that is something that I certainly support. As a matter of fact, it passed just like our thing—that we were going to get 48 hours to read the bill. It passed in the Senate by voice vote. Every Senator said, "Aye." Again, that sounded pretty reasonable to a lot of us.

Now, there are those people who may not follow how everything works here—and God help you if you do follow everything that works here—but know that, once they have passed their bill on the Senate side and once we have passed our bill over here, we each appoint conferees. They go into a conference room, and they hash out the differences between the House bill and the Senate bill, and then it comes back to each body. We vote on it and we are done.

Well, there's a funny thing. One of my favorite movies when I was growing up was "A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum." A funny thing happened on the way to this conference report. The Snowe-Wyden amendment, which said no bonuses for people who got billions of dollars of taxpayer money, was taken out. What was put in instead, Madam Speaker, are these 47 words that are next to me. The 47 words not only removed the Snowe-Wyden amendment that said "no bonuses," but this language specifically protected the bonuses, and authorized AIG and anybody else who got TARP money—who got billions of dollars in financial help from the Federal Government, from our taxpayers—to pay out the bonuses. I'm going to talk about how it got in there in just a minute.

The thing that was amazing last week was that we had people all over

town who were shocked. "I am shocked that they paid out bonuses." "I am shocked that we all had this happen." "We want our money back." "I am shocked." Well, it is a little bit, Madam Speaker, like the guy who takes a bath with the clock radio on the side of the bathtub, and the thing falls in, and he's surprised and he's shocked. Clearly, anybody who voted for the stimulus bill voted to approve the bonuses to AIG and to all the other banks that have sort of led us into this mess, but then they were shocked.

Ms. FOXX. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATOURETTE. I would be happy to yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. FOXX. My memory is this—and maybe you said it and I missed it. My memory is that every Republican voted against the stimulus; is that correct?

Mr. LATOURETTE. That is my recollection, yes.

Ms. FOXX. All right. And 11 Democrats joined us?

Mr. LATOURETTE. That would be correct.

Ms. FOXX. Right. So no Republican voted for that stimulus bill which took out this provision; is that correct?

Mr. LATOURETTE. The gentlelady is correct.

I would just say that, in talking to my Democratic colleagues who voted for the stimulus bill, I think some of them were surprised that this had happened, but I think the point is that this is not the way to legislate. You don't give the power to three or four people to go into a room, to take out an important provision, to then put in an important provision, to not give anybody time to read it, and then say you are surprised that there might be something goofy or embarrassing in the piece of legislation. So, basically, anybody who voted for the stimulus bill voted to give millions of dollars of bonuses to AIG officials and to everybody else.

Now, when they found out and people were embarrassed—and we went through this political theater last week, a charade—a lot of people got up on the floor and said, "We want our money back." You know, "give us our money back." So they used the Tax Code in a way that I have never seen, which said we are going to tax these bonuses at 90 percent. That was their fix. You know, even that fix is—I will use the word—"stupid" because it is only 90 percent. So the top guy at AIG got a \$6.4 million bonus. Even under their fix, he still gets to keep \$640,000. They are either entitled to some money, to all of their money or to none of their money. There is this notion that we fixed it and that we were mean to these people in that we only let them keep \$640,000.

You know, the gentlelady, Ms. Foxx from North Carolina, a person who works in my district outside of Cleveland, Ohio who makes \$40,000 a year would have to work for 16 years to make \$640,000.

Anyway, we had a lot of fancy speeches, and people said, "We are going to fix it." So we have been talking for 2 weeks, Madam Speaker, about how it happened, and nobody is willing to take responsibility. I mean, obviously, the thing, you know, didn't just drop down from the sky, and one paragraph goes out and this paragraph comes in. Somebody had to do it. We started last week with a number of our colleagues, and we said, you know, there are 435 Members of Congress. There are 100 Senators, and so we started with 535 suspects.

□ 1330

Through good detective work by a lot of my colleagues, we have been able to narrow that down because sadly, not one Republican was invited in this room where this deal was cut. So you can take out all 178 Republican Members of the House, all 38 Republican members of the Senate. And then we continued to cram it down.

And we have had public statements from a number of people. There was a report by CNN's Dana Bash that this thing was hashed out over 8 hours. And the President's chief of staff was here and the President's director of the budget was here. And so while we got down and eliminated a lot of Members of Congress, we had to add some people.

So, Madam Speaker, what we have arrived at—and this was one of the favorite games that I played when I was a young person, and I enjoyed very much playing it with my children, and I bet a lot of people in America have played the game of Clue. With apologies to our friends at Hasbro, we now find ourselves with the sad situation where somebody put into this bill the authorization to pay out these millions of dollars of bonuses to AIG and everybody else, and now we're shocked.

Well, those of you who play the game of Clue know you need to have a suspect—or the person that committed it—where it happened—in the House—and what the weapon was.

Now, we started with a great advantage here because we didn't have to go lead pipe, wrench, gun, all of that other stuff. We know the crime was committed with a pen. So we're one-third of the way home. We also have the rooms located here in the Capitol that indicate where activity took place. And I will tell you that we're not there yet, and we really are seeking the person that did this. Just come forward. Just tell us you did it and we can move on to something else. And then maybe you can tell us why you did it, and we will be happy.

But the reports indicate, first of all, they were all pointing to the senator from Connecticut, Senator DODD. And why? Because he was the Chairperson of the Senate Banking Committee, and he is the person who has made some observations that his staff put it in at the suggestion of somebody else's staff and so forth and so on. And I don't know. But it went to him.

But I am not really suspecting Senator DODD because I think he has a vested interest in making sure we clean this up. And, you know, when there is a mystery and you can't solve it, people begin to speculate and people begin to pass out nasty rumors and you become the subject of rumors.

And two rumors that have coordinated around Senator DODD that makes people think, well, he must be the guy. Well, one, is he is the largest recipient of campaign donations from AIG and their executives. And that makes some people say, "Well, of course he did it. He's paying back AIG." I don't think that's true.

Second, there was a second report in the Hartford Courant this week that his wife was employed by a subsidiary of AIG. So that causes the tongue waggers to say, Hey, you know what? We really think it's him.

But, Madam Speaker, I am a big fan of Agatha Christie novels. And the great thing about those novels is you read them, you always think it's the butler and you get to the end of the book, it's not the butler. So I really don't think it was Senator DODD who did this.

The other folks that we have listed here—and I am also ready to give up on the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL of New York. And I think the only reason that we have him here still is was he was quoted coming out of the room—because he was in the room—but when he came out of the room, he said, "It's very frustrating when the Congress is run by only three people." So I think since he's expressing disappointment by that, I don't think he's one of the three people that actually got it done.

Press reports indicate there was shuttle diplomacy between the Speaker's office and the Senate leader's office, and that's why we have the distinguished Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI of California, and the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, Mr. REID of Nevada, over there. And these are their offices.

And we are told that these two people—well, we will start with this fellow. He used to serve with us in the House. He is a fine fellow. He is now the President's chief of staff. His name is Rahm Emanuel from Illinois. And he was here for 8 hours shuttling back and forth between these two offices. And so is this fellow, who may not be as familiar to the Members as Mr. Emanuel, that's Peter Orszag, who happens to be the budget director for the new administration.

So we know from events that a lot of shuttling back and forth over an 8-hour period between these two offices, a deal was eventually struck, this language is inserted, the Snow White language is removed. And the problem we have is nobody will say they did it. And I think that that is a sad state of affairs. I think whoever did it should come forward and tell the American people you

did it. Because whoever did it embarrassed—anybody that voted for the stimulus bill has to be embarrassed by the fact that they authorized the bonus to AIG.

Ms. FOXX. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATOURETTE. I would be happy to.

Ms. FOXX. But no Republicans need to—in the House—need to be embarrassed, right, because none of us voted for this.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Well, the gentleman is right. And that's why we have really done some hard work. I have to give credit to a lot of my cohorts on this. They've really done a lot of work from going from 535 that I think we really are down to these 6 and 7 people.

I should explain the question mark down there because the Secretary of the Treasury has twice appeared before the Financial Services Committee and given testimony. And when asked directly who did it, he said staff at the Treasury communicated with staff and Senator DODD's office. Now, listen, that is the biggest "what, are you kidding me?" I've ever heard because staff can't write legislation, the Treasury can't write legislation. Members of Congress write legislation. And to hide behind the skirts of some unknown, unnamed staff member I think is a tremendous act of cowardice, and so just come out.

But I put the question mark there because that question mark we hope to eventually fill in with the staffer at Treasury who apparently is somehow involved. All we're going to ask that staffer is, "Who told you to do it?" It has to be somebody in power. It can't be the staff got together and said, "Hey, I got a good one. Let's give out some bonuses to AIG." So we are going to continue this quest.

But the point in your special order that I just wanted to raise is that we have this budget next week. And this bill where this horrible thing happened only—and I can't believe I have been in Washington so long I can say "only spent a trillion dollars," the proposal next week on the floor proposes to spend \$3.6 trillion.

And I would just hope under the straight-faced test, can I look at myself in the mirror when I wake up in the morning, that whoever is in charge, whoever happens to be in the next room where this is being negotiated says, You know what? I've got a novel idea. Why don't we let everybody read the bill, understand the bill, so we can have an intelligent debate on the bill. And when it goes to the conference committee and it goes in these rooms and there are only five or six people involved, maybe you check back and say, "You know what? I have made this change. Here's why I made the change. I hope can you go along with it."

But this back door, backhanded sneaky stuff, it doesn't belong not only in the United States Congress, it doesn't belong anywhere.

So I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I would enlist the gentleman from Georgia, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentlelady from North Carolina as junior sleuths. And we will continue this discussion next week, and we're going to find out who did it, what room it happened in, with the pen.

I thank the gentlelady.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for coming up with this very innovative way of describing this process, and I hope that the folks who created the game Clue are going to appreciate that there may be a revival of interest in it and that our young folks who are listening will look up the word "sleuths" and if they don't know that word, it's a good word to learn today. I advocate young people learn one word every day, and they can join us as sleuths and perhaps become identified with what we are doing here in terms of figuring out who is spending all of this money, who is putting these items in these bills that nobody has a chance to read because they are coming up at the last minute. They have to be done right now, and if they are not done right now, the world is going to come to an end.

But I know that our colleague, Mr. THOMPSON from Pennsylvania, is going to be sharing some great insights with us about the budget and, again, other activities that we are doing. He has just joined the Congress in this session, but he's already making a great name for himself in terms of presenting items on the floor and doing hard work as a Member of Congress.

So I would yield the floor to Mr. THOMPSON from Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentlelady for yielding me some time here.

Obviously, today there are serious concerns about the President's budget, a budget that borrows too much and spends too much and taxes just way too much.

Prior to my running for Congress this past year, I spent 28 years in the health care business. And one of the first things you learn in the medical profession is "do no harm."

So, Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today to speak briefly about the harm the President's budget will cause back in rural Pennsylvania. My rural district is much like the heartland of this country. Mom-and-pop shops, family farms, small businesses. Just run-of-the-mill folks looking for a fair shake.

So in evaluating the President's budget, I asked myself one question: will this proposal help or hamper the economic growth in my district. And truth be told, it didn't take long for me to answer this simple question.

Increasing taxes on small businesses, as this budget proposes, will penalize the very segment of the economy that is best equipped to get us back on track. Small businesses are creating 7 out of every 10 jobs. They are the backbone of rural America. They are the

farmers that harvest much of the food that we eat. They are the small, independently owned energy companies whose employees go to work each day with the goal of achieving American energy independence. They are the independent truckers that haul the goods that we consume.

You see, Madam Speaker, these are not Republican or Democrat jobs, but they are jobs that are at risk of being eliminated if this budget proceeds as currently written.

The President's new cap-and-tax energy policy, which will inevitably drive up the cost of every manufactured and processed good we consume, will increase utility bills and will cost more just to fuel up at the tank and will devastate rural America.

Madam Speaker, oil was discovered in my district 150 years ago. We are also home to the most promising natural gas play in the country and the third largest in the world. Many of my constituents make a living by harvesting the natural resources that we are blessed with. These same natural resources, I may add, that are used to build windmills, solar panels and bio-refineries.

You see, without natural gas and oil, there would be no windmills or solar panels. These very natural resources are the key feedstock in manufacturing the next generation of clean energy sources.

So we should celebrate the American energy industry, the fuels that made this country what it is today, the fuels that will serve as a bridge to the renewable energy future; not penalize it, as does this budget that the President proposes.

All is not lost, however. The Speaker will have an opportunity to allow fruitful debate and deliberation next week when the budget comes to the floor. House Republicans will put forward a budget proposal that offers smart government solutions and address the very issues I've laid out.

The American people are hurting. The economy is on life support. And if the Democratic leadership asks themselves this simple one question—will this budget help or hamper economic growth—they will come to the table and work with Republicans to find a reasonable compromise for the good of the entire country.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield for just a second?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I certainly will.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me because I had some interesting statistics that follow right in with what Representative THOMPSON was talking about.

And in regard to those small businesses in his district, I think he described his district is very much like mine in northwest Georgia.

But just before we started this hour with Ms. FOXX controlling the time on discussing this budget, I had met with

a good friend from the American Chemistry Council, and we sat down. He talked to me about this budget, this \$3.6 trillion budget that borrows too much, spends too much, it taxes too much.

And he said, PHIL, let me just tell you what this does to jobs that are—business are part of the American Chemistry Council membership. But in your district, the 11th of Georgia, we're talking about 1,500 direct jobs and 95,000 indirect employees of the chemical industry in the 11th District. And he was talking about the same thing Representative THOMPSON was talking about in regard to that energy tax, that hidden energy tax. And this business in chemicals and plastics, they are very energy dependent.

And then on top of all of that, this cap-and-tax where the President is trying to get \$600 billion to spend on education and a single-payer health care system and green energy, it's really hurting these small businesses that depend on electricity. And there is a Superfund tax of \$2.8 billion over 2 years. They do a lot of things with accounting that hurts small businesses.

But I just wanted to—because it's so important. It goes along right with what is going on in western Pennsylvania.

I appreciate the gentleman for yielding, and I will yield back to him.

□ 1345

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. The fact is, it sounds like our districts are very similar, and we're hurting right now, and we need leadership, leadership with a vision for smart government solutions, and that's not what I'm seeing with this proposal coming forward next week from the President.

With that, I thank the gentlelady.

Ms. FOXX. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for coming and sharing his perspective. As he indicated, we all represent small businesses. We all represent people who are struggling in this country. Middle class families and small businesses are making tremendous sacrifices when it comes to their own budgets. They're learning to live within their budgets, but Washington continues to spend trillions in taxpayer dollars on bailouts and other government programs.

We have people up here who are so out of touch with the American people. Some of them never go home. Some of them have been in Washington 50 years. A vast majority of the majority party has been here for a long, long time. Many of them have parents who served in Congress. They really are out of touch with the average American, and I think it's extraordinarily unfortunate.

I'd now like to yield some time to our distinguished colleague from Michigan, the chairman of the Policy Committee, Mr. MCCOTTER, who always has an interesting perspective to bring to us and usually some words we have

to look up in the dictionary to see exactly what the definition is.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentlelady. I will try to not use any words that anyone finds indecipherable or offensive.

One of the reasons that we are here today addressing this budget is tied directly, intellectually, to the Clue game that our colleague from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) put forward.

In trying to find out who put into the stimulus bill the AIG bonuses, protections, and approvals, we are getting to the heart of what type of policy we can expect from this administration. Do we have an entrepreneurial, humane economy or do we continue to go with the too-big-to-fail model that has already failed and cost taxpayers hundreds of billions of their dollars? This AIG amendment clearly shows that the mistakes that were made last fall with the Wall Street bailout are being perpetuated today. We cannot have this.

The reason our economy is recessed is because of misfeasance and chaos within our financial institutions. Today, the budget that we have before us of \$3.6 trillion sends the signal to the American people not just that it borrows too much, not just that it spends too much, not just that it taxes too much, but that the misfeasance and chaos, the collapse of the financial markets, is on the verge of collapsing our political institutions.

The dot.com bubble which hurt so many people was, as we know now, replaced with a housing bubble. This housing bubble has collapsed. This budget is an attempt to replace the housing bubble with a government bubble, a bubble in the trillions of dollars of taxpayers' money. And when the government bubble breaks, as inevitably it will, where will we be?

We have to get back to commonsense priorities, not only in our political institutions, but within our financial institutions. And one of the fundamental concepts has to be that responsibility will be encouraged and rewarded here, irresponsibility will not be.

So to see the situation in our country, a very dire one economically for so many, including those in my home State of Michigan who have experienced 12 percent unemployment, for them to see this institution believe it can simply spend trillions of dollars to get us out of this situation tells them that their government is on the verge of making chaotic, shortsighted, long-term, injurious decisions. And you can see this in their comments to my office, and I'm sure my colleagues can see this in their comments to you.

They want order, sanity, justice, equity restored not only to these financial institutions that failed but to the political institutions that are supposed to work for them. And yet as we watch proposals to go through to allow too-big-to-fail to continue to be the operative theory, we are on the verge of seeing the United States government too-big-to-succeed.

Big government does not stop chaos. Big government is chaos. And with the expansion in the trillions that is proposed today, we can talk about the items such as cap-and-tax that will hurt my blue collar and white collar people in the manufacturing industry; we can talk about how all those costs will be passed on to hard pressed consumers to shrink their family budgets for consumer goods that have had this tax added on and passed on or into their home energy prices at the very worst time for them; we can talk about abstract numbers and deficits. But let us be clear, the American people know that this is an irresponsible budget and that in a very chaotic time all it will do is increase the chaos around them that threatens their hearths at home.

We have to stand firm. We have to say "no." We cannot borrow and spend our way out of prosperity. We cannot tax our way into prosperity, but we can do the opposite.

And I would encourage all Members of this caucus, this Congress, to remember one thing: our prosperity is from the private sector, not the public sector. The corporations are pass-throughs for taxes. They do not pay them. They collect them from you. And the more we allow the private sector, individual, hardworking men and women to have to pay more for the cost of government, the longer it is going to be before we can hand to our children the Nation's greatest economy on earth which we inherited and which today we have to preserve for them.

I thank the gentlelady for the time.

Ms. FOXX. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his comments, and I actually had a constituent come to me this week and say what do you think about the phrase "America, too big to fail"? That's a scary notion because that phrase has been used for these agencies and institutions that have been failing, and it is scary for us to think about that.

This is the greatest country in the world. We have been extraordinarily successful by being very prudent in the way that we spend money. For two centuries, Americans have worked hard so their children could have better lives and greater opportunity. Democrats now want to reverse that order by having our children work hard so we don't have to make the hard economic choices now that need to be made.

It is a terribly cynical approach to governing, and it is one that I can hardly believe we've come to in this country. But it appears to be that way, and I thank, again, Mr. McCOTTER from Michigan for always putting things in a very strong philosophical light to make us think about them in the larger order. And of course, we always need to think that way. I'm very grateful to him for doing that.

I now want to yield back to my colleague from Georgia for a few more comments about where we are, and then I will wind up our Special Order for today and hope that we give the

American people a lot to think about this weekend.

Most of us are going home to our districts where we'll be dealing with our constituents. They will be telling us how this budget's going to affect them and what's happening to them on a day-to-day basis, and this is the kind of thing we always need to stay in touch with.

So I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Once again, Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina, my good friend, VIRGINIA FOXX, and thank her for bringing this information to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle because here it is, late Thursday afternoon, but we will be right back here on Monday and probably be in session next week until maybe even Friday or Saturday—I think it's possible we'll be here until Saturday—to try to pass this House version of the budget.

I'm very hopeful that there will be some significant cuts, as Mr. SPRATT, the chairman of the Budget Committee, brings that budget to the floor for a vote, and I hope there will be an opportunity for a Republican alternative. Certainly, we have a very good Republican alternative. I think there was a press conference on that today led by JOHN BOEHNER and PAUL RYAN the ranking member on the Budget Committee.

We need to make sure that all people are represented in this people's House, and, hopefully, we will have a good debate next week and come up with a budget that's more reasonable than what the President has sent over here that was drawn up by his economic advisers, Christina Roemer and Larry Summers and, of course, Peter Orszag, the OMB, Office of Management and Budget, director. Our Congressional Budget Office, bipartisan to the core, said that his predictions of the amount of deficit were \$2.3 trillion short.

And before I yield back to Ms. FOXX, I want to just talk about some of the things in that budget that almost are incredulous.

You know, Madam Speaker, this weekend I guess starting what, tonight, we go right back to pick up, as we go home—and I'm sure lots of folks across the country will be enjoying March Madness as the Sweet Sixteen gets down to the Final Four late Sunday afternoon. So this March Madness is wonderful for sports fans, and I know that President Obama is a big sports fan, in fact a big basketball fan; but I have had people in my district say there is no place in Washington for March Madness, but that's exactly what we're looking at in regard to this budget. I mean, it's unbelievable.

Listen to this, Madam Speaker, in regard to increasing taxes during a recession, preposterous. Total tax increases during this recession over the next 10 years, \$1.4 trillion; taxes on small businesses—which by the way we all know, nobody disputes the fact that they cre-

ate about 75, 80 percent of the jobs in this country—this cap-and-tax, or cap-and-trade as President Obama calls it, this is a hidden tax of \$646 billion on every man, woman, and child in this country. It causes the energy costs, electricity, natural gas, it just goes up, and it's a hidden tax.

But every month, the middle class, the small working people, the small businesses are paying that tax so that we can take that money, put it in a reserve fund and pay for national, government-run health care, which I quite honestly think that the people of this country spoke loud and clear, Madam Speaker, back in 1993-94 when they totally rejected HillaryCare.

So, you know, we do need to reform health care, and we need to have our market-driven system improved. And we're all for that on this side of the aisle and reduce the number of uninsured, and we can do that without giving a blank check to the Federal Government.

But I could go on about some of these taxes, but I know Representative FOXX, who's leading the hour, has a number of things that she wants to talk about in the final 15 minutes or so. So I just want to thank the gentlelady for letting me join her, and I look forward to seeing her back next week as we try to bring some sense into the budget process.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his help on this Special Order. I think that having a variety of folks come in and speak about this issue is much better than having one talking head here. We have lots of different perspectives. We come from different experiences. I think that's very important to us.

But I want to summarize some of the things that we have been talking about, and frankly, I hadn't thought about using the term "March Madness" for what's going on, but I certainly do think it's an appropriate term for the proposals that have been made for this budget.

But I want to again reiterate some of the things that have been said before. This budget will give us the largest tax increase in the history of this country. It will be more borrowing than all the other Presidents have proposed in the history of this country.

□ 1400

If you take every President from President George Washington to President George W. Bush, what President Obama has recommended and what the Democrats have endorsed in this Congress is going to create more gross debt in 10 years than all the other President's combined. That is a pretty staggering thing to think about.

Thomas Jefferson was a very wise man. He's represented here in this Chamber. We have a lot of folks in the gallery today. I'll point out to you that around the top of the House there are these profiles of people. All of them are ancient lawgivers except two. Behind

me, over the Speaker's podium, there are two Americans—Thomas Jefferson to my right and George Mason to my left. The rest are ancient lawgivers—with Moses being over the center door in full face.

We honor Jefferson in this country. The Democrats supposedly honor Thomas Jefferson for his wisdom. But this is what he said—and they have certainly forgotten this—"I sincerely believe that the principle of spending money to be paid by posterity under the name of funding is but swindling futurity on a large scale." Thomas Jefferson, 1816.

Our Founders understood this. They wanted a small Federal Government, not one that would oppress the people, not one that would give us huge tax increases and take money from the people. They can spend better than the government can spend it. That's what Thomas Jefferson believed in—and I believe in that—and I'm so sorry that the Democrats have forgotten the lessons he taught their party and taught our country.

Another thing in this budget is a new energy tax that will cost every household up to \$3,128 annually. The President promised tax cuts. There's going to be about \$600 in tax cuts given to the average family. But, in exchange for that, they're going to be \$3,128 more for energy. It doesn't sound like a good deal to me. It's also going to cost American jobs.

We know the cap-and-tax plan, in addition to all these taxes, are going to cost jobs, because the majority of the tax increases are going to fall on small businesses. They're not going to be able to keep being the engine of job creation that they have been.

There's going to be a new tax on charitable giving, which could cost American charities at least \$9 billion a year. The cynical attitude behind this is: We don't need the private sector doing all these things. We're going to take your money because government knows how to spend the money better.

In fact, it will destroy many charities in this country that are doing wonderfully good things. But it will hurt them and, in some cases, destroy them, all in the name of having the government run our country.

Some people have said that this sounds a lot like Animal Farm. I would say to people: If you haven't read 1984, if you haven't read Animal Farm in a long time, or, if you've never read them, get them out and read them and think about what's happening in this country as it compares to what was written in those books.

This will be the highest level of borrowing ever. It's going to be unchecked spending, which will result in borrowing hundreds of billions of dollars from China, the Middle East, and other nations that own our growing debt.

As I said earlier, for the first two centuries of this country, Americans have worked hard so their children could have better lives and better op-

portunities. Democrats want to reverse that order by having our children work hard so we don't have to make the hard choices now.

Let me show you another chart here. Again, you don't have to take my word for it. I can show it to you graphically.

This is going to be doubling the debt held by the public. Look how those numbers go up. This is what it was under Republican control of the Congress and a Republican administration. This is what it is under Democratic control.

According to the CBO, President Obama's budget would add \$9.3 trillion to the national debt. This will lead to unprecedented borrowing, with debt held by the public increasing from 41 percent of GDP in 2008 to 82 percent of GDP in 2019. We have never seen that kind of debt, even in wartime.

In 2010, the budget's going to spend \$172 billion on interest on the national debt. Just think about that—\$172 billion just on interest. It's going to be piling up more and more debt and less money to spend on real priorities.

This is not the way for America. Putting our children and grandchildren into debt is wrong.

After we had the bailout last fall, I went home and I was taking my grandchildren to school and they said to me, "What were you doing in Washington? We know you were up there, you came back, you went back." I said to my 12-year-old grandson and 9½-year-old granddaughter—I said, "Well, what the Congress just did was put you, your children, and your grandchildren into debt for more money than you're ever going to be able to pay off." And my 9½-year-old granddaughter Rana said to me, "Grandma, why do you want to put little children into debt? I said, "Rana, I don't. That's why I voted "no." That's why most Republicans voted "no."

We understand what's happening here. We don't want to do this. But what is about to occur here is even worse than what happened last fall, even worse than what happened with the stimulus. These people are going headlong in because they don't want to take the responsibility to do what needs to be done now—trim spending and make tough decisions.

Somebody said the other day that we're pretty soon going to be like Argentina, because the Federal Reserve is printing dollars trying to get the economy stimulated. The government's spending, spending, spending. We're pretty soon going to go into a situation where we're going to look like a third-world country.

I don't think that's what most Americans want. Most Americans love this country, they want us to continue to be the greatest country in the world, and they want us to continue to be successful in what we do. They want us to leave a country that is good and economically and fiscally healthy to our children and our grandchildren and to our posterity.

That's not the direction the Democrats are taking us. They cannot blame this on the Republicans because they have been in charge of the Congress since January 2007. They started the spending going that way.

The President, who's promised so many good things and led the American people to think that he would be a moderate person and who would bring good change to this country, is bringing change, all right—the kind of change that is going to lead us down a very, very dark path and create problems that will take a long, long time for us to fix.

So I want to say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that this is the wrong thing to be doing. You've been cramming things down our throats and down the throats of the American people for the past 2½ months. This is not the direction this country should be going in.

We need to be fiscally responsible. We need to remember our oath to the Constitution. We need to be looking after this country and the people who elected us here to do that.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to rise today to speak on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus about the importance of the Employee Free Choice Act.

First, I want to thank Representatives LYNN WOOLSEY and RAÚL GRIJALVA for their leadership as co-chairs of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. Each week we come to the floor to speak to the American people about important progressive values that we share.

I want to thank also Chairman GEORGE MILLER for his strong leadership on the Employee Free Choice Act and for being a stalwart champion for working people throughout his impressive career. I feel fortunate to consider Chairman MILLER both a friend and a mentor, and especially when it comes to workers rights.

It's time for us to set the record straight about the Employee Free Choice Act. Due to the well-funded opposition campaign by corporate interests, a lot of misinformation about the Employee Free Choice Act has filled our airways, our newspapers, and public discourse. Well, it's time for that to stop. Let's set aside the myths and talk about reality.

First, to fully understand the importance of the Employee Free Choice Act, an appreciation of the history and context of organized labor in America is a prerequisite. In 1935, the Congress

passed the National Labor Relations Act. The purpose of the legislation, as stated in the text, was to protect “the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection.”

Now I know a little bit, but not a lot, about organized labor. What I do know is that for my grandfather, for his father, for my mother, the importance of organized labor and the labor movement was actually to move people into the workforce, into good-paying jobs with great benefits and to be able to work into the middle class. This was important for my family and it's important to families all across this country.

As a direct result of the act, many decades went by where workers successfully formed unions without interference by employers.

Now, to be sure, let's celebrate the tremendous courage of workers across this country and throughout history who stood up for their rights—stood up for their rights to good benefits, stood up for their rights for good wage, stood up for their rights for working conditions that were safe in the work place.

Over the last decade, the National Labor Relations Board elections have fallen by 50 percent. For instance, in 2007, only 30,000 workers actually gained collective bargaining through the National Labor Relations Board certification. This precipitous decline is due to many companies fighting the National Labor Relations Act at every turn and the unfair labor practices of many businesses.

The instances of businesses taking or threatening to take punitive actions against employees who attempt to organize have, once again, Mr. Speaker, become all too common. In fact, in a recent survey report, 79 percent of workers were likely or very likely or at least somewhat likely to be fired for trying to organize a union. Fired for trying to organize a union. Fired for trying to organize collectively to fight for themselves and working families in this country.

In 25 percent of organizing drives, at least one worker is lawfully fired for a union activity. Can you believe it—in America you can be fired for trying to organize collectively for good benefits and strong wages and safe working conditions in your workplace? Yet, this is exactly what is happening to workers across this country right here in the United States.

As you can tell in the current business climate that is rife with fear and intimidation, workers are rightfully afraid to engage in union organizing—afraid to engage in working with their fellow employees to fight for their rights as workers.

Recently, over 150 historians wrote a letter to all of us in Congress expressing their support for the Employee

Free Choice Act. As they note—and I want to emphasize—the Employee Free Choice Act is necessary as a direct result of the erosion of good faith actions of employers against their employees organizing and forming a union. It is a public policy response to those who have been fought against in the workplace. It's a public policy response on behalf of workers in support of their right to organize and form a union. This climate of fear hasn't existed in our Nation for many years. Unfair labor practices were originally mitigated by the National Labor Relations Act.

□ 1415

But, once again, our Nation's workers need our help. We must pass the Employee Free Choice Act in order to break down the barriers to organizing created by far too many employers.

Now, not all employers are working against workers. In fact, there are many employers who are working with workers who are organizing collectively to bargain for their rights. But there are some really bad actors in the system, and the Employee Free Choice Act aims to clear up the bad actors.

Mr. Speaker, next I believe it is important to address the myths that have been perpetrated by businesses determined to deprive workers of fundamental rights, and there is a lot of mythology out there. The most widely repeated and factually inaccurate statement about the Employee Free Choice Act is that it would abolish the secret ballot election. You have heard it on the news, you have seen it in the television advertising, but it is nothing more than a public relations stunt to turn the American workforce against organized labor. So let's clear it up.

The fallacy was actually originated by public relations campaigns financed by corporations determined to defeat the Employee Free Choice Act. And even more frustrating, it has been widely reported as the impetus behind former supporters flip-flopping on their Employee Free Choice Act position; that is, against workers. This myth is repeated daily by the media outlets, opponents, and former supporters, and it is just plain wrong.

The process these critics are referring to is the National Labor Relations Board Election. But the reality is, is that it is about the employees' choice about what kind of election, what kind of choice they want to make. Under the Employee Free Choice Act, the election process is preserved. The mythology is wrong.

Under the Employee Free Choice Act, it would enable the workers simply to access a different method, an alternative method to form a union, through majorities signing up saying that they want a union and that they would prefer that kind of process. Under current law, workers can only use the majority signing up on a card process if the employer agrees.

Now, this is a fundamental worker's right to choose what kind of election

they want. That is what the Employee Free Choice Act is; it is about freedom of choice on behalf of the workers to choose the kind of process they want to form a union or not. So it doesn't destroy the ballot process. In fact, workers could elect still, under the Employee Free Choice Act, for a secret ballot, or they could elect to sign up with a majority signing up for a union. The difference is that they can't be coerced by employers. So there are many myths that have permeated the recent dialogue. I want to take a moment to address each of these individually.

First, the first myth is that the secret ballot election protects workers' democratic rights. The fact is that the National Labor Relations Board election process currently fails to satisfy the most basic standards for a free and fair election. In these processes, the employer has total access to the employee. The employer can coerce, can show videotape, can do all kinds of things to keep employees from signing up to form a union. The workers, on the other hand, have very little access to their fellow employees to help to organize them.

Secret ballots in themselves don't guarantee fair elections. We have all seen that. There is nothing that is so sacred about that secret ballot process when it comes to a union election. So we want to create a process by which employees can choose how they want to form a union, employees can choose how they want to organize collectively for their own benefit.

So the standard procedure in the National Labor Relations Board—and I will just yield for a minute to my colleague who organizes our Progressive Hour. I will yield to my colleague from the great State of Minnesota to have some dialogue about the Employee Free Choice Act and about the benefits to organizing for workers.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentle lady yield?

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. ELLISON. I have a question for you about the Employee Free Choice Act. Is this a proven idea? You know, this idea of a card check, of getting a majority of the workers to sign up and then have the union recognized, has this been tried anywhere before? I yield back.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Employees, actually, in a number of countries around the world that have unions that organize, workers who organize to form unions in fact use this process, and it would not be an anomaly to the United States to use a majority signup process. Indeed, here in this country workers have done that as well.

So what we are doing with the Employee Free Choice Act is we are actually codifying the ability of workers to decide how they want to organize.

Mr. ELLISON. In my own city of Minneapolis, the management of the city reached out to the workers and said, if you all want to have a card check in order to get your union recognized, that is the process we will go by.

I can list a number of employers who have voluntarily done card check, and it has not harmed these companies. In fact, as you pointed out, Congresswoman, there are a lot of American companies that have very good relationships with their workers that are humming along and making profit right now. So there is no reason to believe that if we make the Employee Free Choice Act law, that it would in any way undermine any productivity.

May I ask you another question, if I may?

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Reclaiming my time, I would like to say to the gentleman from Minnesota that in fact if we study what has just happened recently with the auto industry—and many Americans have been looking at the business pages and the front pages about the trouble that American auto workers and the industry face right now. Those employees and employers sat down and bargained in an agreement about benefits, about wages, about working conditions. They came to an agreement. And it wasn't as though it wasn't a hard-fought agreement. Some of these are difficult-to-win agreements. But they did.

Then, when it came time that the auto industry was facing troubles, the auto industry and the union appeared together before the United States Congress, and workers sat down at a bargaining table again and were willing to make the kinds of concessions that you actually might not have gotten if you had to coerce them; but, in fact, they had to come together to work on an agreement that would help preserve the industry.

This is the benefit of collective bargaining. This is the benefit of having an equal voice for workers as we have for employers.

Mr. ELLISON. If the gentlelady would yield, I want to ask you a more fundamental question. Are unions good for America? I yield back.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. You know, I come from a family of union workers. My grandfather and my great grandfather worked in the coal mines of West Virginia, where they didn't enjoy the greatest protections in that coal mine. My grandfather in fact ended up dying of a respiratory disease. And I think that today, the reason that our mine workers enjoy protection, the reason that our auto workers enjoy protection on those assembly lines, the reason that workers like my mother many years ago in a cannery in California enjoyed protection for safety considerations and for wages and benefits was precisely because they were enabled to organize as a union.

So companies that have unions that are organized in their workplace actually do enjoy profits, unlike others. There are incentives for employees to stay at a workplace and to develop loyalty to that employer precisely because they struck a deal.

So workers are not just a good benefit for organizing and unions aren't

just a good benefit for workers. As my colleague knows, organizing and unions are actually good for employers, they are good for economic growth, they are good for productivity. And that is why here in the United States over this last decade, as we have seen this really precipitous decline in union membership, we have also seen a real flat-lining of wages, a flat-lining of benefits. In fact, the American workers has lost so much in wages and benefits over this last decade that one might argue in fact that it is precisely because they are not organized together to form a union to lobby and negotiate on their own behalf for benefits that we have seen this decline. And I would yield to my colleague.

Mr. ELLISON. As I might point out, Congresswoman and Mr. Speaker, the fact is that having a union creates labor peace. We don't have costly strikes, lockouts. We have labor peace. We make an agreement, and everybody sort of—we have a refined orderly way to resolve conflict. And as you pointed out, sometimes these conflicts over a bargaining table are tough struggles. Nobody is expecting to just give anything away, but there is an orderly way to resolve issues. Turnover, which is a definite killer for productivity, is reduced when you have a union in place.

Unions tend to promote reliability. You have a place to go, you can go to your shop steward if there is something you think isn't right. And it provides a way for real stability on the job. Also, I think it is important to say that a lot of unions have training programs of their own, which it shares the burden with the employer.

So unions have been good for many employers and have been good for America. Union workers earn 30 percent more than nonunion workers. And when it comes to African American unionized people, they earn 56 percent more than nonunion African Americans. Women benefit from being in the union. Upwards of 40, 50 percent of women who are unionized make that much more than women who are not. Pensions, medical benefits. It is good to have a union job. Everybody knows that. And unions have not contributed to economic demise of any community or our country. In fact, unions have brought labor peace, unions have benefited our country in a great way.

And I just might add, before I turn it back to the gentlelady from Maryland, Congresswoman, I will never forget the image of Walter Reuther, the great UAW leader and Martin Luther King walking down Woodward Avenue in Detroit. I will never forget that when Martin Luther King went to his reward on April 4, 1968, he was at a union. He was standing up for garbage strikers, sanitation workers who were on strike because they were paid poorly and in unsafe working conditions and were dealing with these issues. And it is important to remember that the union won that strike.

So unions have contributed to the life of America. Unions have done a

service for our great country. And so I think it is important that we point that out as we talk about the Employee Free Choice Act. And I yield back.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. And to my colleague from Minnesota, first, thank you for your leadership and organizing this time when we can speak to the American people about important progressive values.

You know, in the days that exist currently, in the old days, these standard Union Labor Relations Board elections have included a lot of practices that really that are hard-felt and hit workers in a very unfair way.

For example, employees have no right to free speech in the process. Employees can't access media in the process. Employees don't have protection against intimidation and one-on-one interviews with their supervisors where they could believe that in choosing a union it would jeopardize their jobs. Workers are regularly forced to attend anti-union meetings. Well, the union doesn't and the workers trying to form a union don't get that same kind of access to employees. So it is really an unfair process that exists currently.

So what Chairman MILLER and all of us in Congress who really want to see employees with the free choice, the right to choose a union do so because we are interested in workers freely making their own choice about their workplace.

Mr. ELLISON. Would the gentlelady yield?

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. I will in just one minute. But we want to know that we want workers able to attend meetings where they can discuss the values and the value of organizing in a union, where they could discuss the prospects for them ahead in wages and benefits and working conditions. And this can only take place in a context where those trying to organize a union have as much access to workers as the employer does.

And I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ELLISON. I have heard this term, "captive audience," as I have discussed the Employee Free Choice Act, and heard stories about how, when the union drive was going on, that the employer can make it a condition of a worker's employment that they show up at a meeting where they give anti-union messages. Is this really true?

□ 1430

Is this really true? I yield back. Does this happen in America?

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman that what happens in a workplace can sometimes be a little innocuous. And so it may not be a direct threat. But if your employer is sitting with you, next to you while you're reading a union flier about organizing a union in your workplace, that is a little intimidating. If a decision by the employer about handing out raises is coming along and you're one of the

workers trying to organize a union, you might believe that in doing that you may not get a raise, very intimidating, or that you may be under threat of losing your job entirely.

These are not stories that are made up. These are cases that came before the National Labor Relations Board every single day. They are stories that come from our organizers out in the field across the country who are trying to organize in work places. Indeed this last summer I had the real privilege of standing with the workers of the United Food and Commercial Workers Union trying to get a union at the Smithfield Tar Heel produce processing plant in North Carolina. And the intimidation that those workers described in their quest over many years to gain recognition in that work place was really tremendous.

It is unfair. That is the key. It is unfair. Workers ought to be able to freely decide with their colleagues and with their co-workers, do I want a union representing me or not? Which union do I want to represent me? And who is the leadership of that union representing me? These are choices that workers ought to be able to freely and independently make. And under the current process, that is not happening.

I would yield to my colleague.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, I'm going to commend you, Congresswoman, for going down to North Carolina and standing with those workers. It is not easy. I have been on many a picket line myself. I have been on many a union drive because I believe in it. I think it strengthens the working class.

You're right. There are subtle points of intimidation to prevent the union. But there are lots of places in this country where there is not-so-subtle intimidation to prevent the union. There are people fired for trying to organize a union. And even if you prove that it is an unfair labor practice that you were fired for organizing a union, generally even if you win, at the NLRB what happens? Well, a minor fine maybe, a posting up on the wall that says we were wrong for doing this. In fact, it is really not a real deterrent to some of the unfair labor practices that we have seen.

I think that having a union in place would definitely strengthen a worker's right to raise issues that are of concern to them at the workplace as you point out.

I hope the gentlelady doesn't mind me taking a little turn to make a few comments that I would like to make. And I also want to thank you for holding it down. It was your idea that we do the Employee Free Choice Act today, it was your organization that brought this session about, and this is critically important that we do this subject because we do need to help the public understand that a strong workforce that is organized and unionized gives voice not just only to unionized people but to the entire middle class.

And so I do want to thank you for organizing this today. All I want to do is

just take a little short detour for a moment and say that the Employee Free Choice Act, we also talk about card check, majority card check. As you pointed out, if you get 30 percent of the employees to sign a card, you can get an election for a union now. That is the present law. And nothing about that will be stripped away by the Employee Free Choice Act. But it is also important to say that even if you get, even if you get majority sign up and you get the union recognized or you get 30 percent which then provokes a union election and you get the union recognized that way, that is not the end of the Employee Free Choice Act.

The Employee Free Choice Act recognizes the fact that even after union recognition comes, a lot of employers fight and fight the contract, and you can have a union but no contract. And I would love to hear if you have any stories about that because it is important to talk about how workers have dealt with these things.

But the Employee Free Choice Act requires a period in which there is mediation on the contract, and then if that doesn't work, there is binding arbitration on the first contract so that there will be a first contract. And after there is one contract, then history tells us there will be another one. But there will be a first contract under the Employee Free Choice Act. So it is not just card check, but it is getting that first contract at the bargaining table.

So I will yield back to the gentlelady at this time because I just want to make sure that we frame what the bill says and what it doesn't say. And again I invite the gentlelady if she cares to talk about this effort to get the first contract which is so often a difficulty. Of course, I don't want to narrow what the gentlelady might comment on.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Reclaiming my time from the gentleman from Minnesota.

What I would like to say is that we have all heard, many of us across the country have heard the story and the plight of our air traffic controllers who after the de-establishment of their union have then re-established and have been trying to get a contract and are put off time and time and time again. And so that the process from the time one decides one wants a union, that workers decide they want a union, to the time they actually get a contract that they can work under can be sorely delayed under the current process. And so what we would like to say in the Employee Free Choice Act is, do you know what? Once workers have decided that they want to form a union, sit down at the bargaining table, come up with a negotiation, negotiate a contract that is fairly bargained with the employer on one side of the table and the workers on the other side of the table, come up with an agreement, and then get to work. And that is all the Employee Free Choice Act does. It is actually pretty simple, bargain one, come up with a contract, and get to work.

So I'm actually excited about the prospect both for workers and for their employers to have certainty in the workplace about what the rules are, about what the game plan is. And the Employee Free Choice Act gives the employees the freedom to choose to have a union, then to negotiate an agreement and then to get to work being productive both for the employer, but also for themselves and their families. To me that seems like a really fair deal.

There are a lot of myths surrounding the Employee Free Choice Act. And some of those have been played out, of course, on television, in the newspapers and in the back-and-forth dialogue. But I just want to talk about what is important for workers. It is important for workers to be protected against pressure. Now some people say, why can't workers form a union just like you get into the United States Congress? You go and cast your secret ballot, and then you're a Member of Congress. Well, the fact of the matter is that when I go and cast my ballot for President or for Congress, there is no employer standing next to me, there is no employer looking over my shoulder to see what I will do or potentially threatening my job. I can cast my ballot and do it in relative quiet and safety and under my own guidance.

This is not true for elections that take place in the workplace. This is why it is really important for workers to be able to organize, to go around and talk with their colleagues about the importance of forming a union and then to get their accord to do so.

Now it doesn't say that if employees decide that they want to have a secret ballot election that that can still take place. The point is, there is a choice. And it is not the employer's choice. It is not Congress' choice. It is the employees' choice about what they want to do. And so we have to really destroy this mythology.

Before we go on, I would like to talk about another myth because there are a lot of myths surrounding the Employee Free Choice Act.

Mr. ELLISON. If the gentlelady will yield just on that point.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. ELLISON. I'm curious to get the gentlelady's views on this point.

Now, on that myth you just talked about right there, is it common, in your view, allowing for the fact that there are a lot of good employers who cooperate with their unions, but is it common in your view for some of these folks who are opposing the Employee Free Choice Act, some of these big CEOs who are opposing the Employee Free Choice Act, to spend a lot of time worrying about whether a worker has a private ballot or not? Is there any irony here that you have been able to detect?

I yield back.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Reclaiming my time from the gentleman.

This notion that somehow I think that these CEOs are looking out for the workers, they want to protect the workers, let's destroy that myth as well. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that, in fact, what we have with the Employee Free Choice Act is a pretty simple and perhaps even old battle. You have employers who don't want a union because they know that union workers organized collectively will bargain for good wages, good benefits and safe working conditions. And on other hand, you have employees who want to form a union precisely because they don't have good wages, they don't have good benefits, and they don't have safe working conditions.

The reality is that it is cheaper not to provide good wages, it is cheaper not to provide good benefits, and it is cheaper not to have safe working conditions. And so employers can't both want to produce a product or a service and make a lot of profit on that at the expense of workers.

So, all we are asking, and it is a pretty simple prospect, we are asking simply for workers to be able to organize themselves, decide who represents them, and sit down as an equal bargaining partner at the bargaining table with their employer. And in the end, it is a win-win for employers and for workers.

And I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ELLISON. And I would add to society at large.

Let me say that 79 percent of workers surveyed reported that workers are very, or at least somewhat, likely to be fired for trying to organize a union, an important fact I think we need to point out. And in about 25 percent of all organizing drives, at least one worker is unlawfully fired for union activity.

So again, this kind of protection, this stress-free way to either have a union recognized or not I think is a very, very good idea.

I believe the gentlelady was kind of going down myths that are out there. Let's bust a few more myths. I think that it is important to point out that this does not hurt small business. Small businesses would not be harmed by the Employee Free Choice Act. In fact, small business stand to gain from the Employee Free Choice Act. It is interesting to me that in a time when we talk about "too big to fail" and these huge, enormous businesses, some of them opposing the Employee Free Choice Act, it is the small business, again, that is often at the back end of the line on this stuff. But along that alone, let's just say that small business owners are supporting the bill and are beginning to speak out all over the country.

In fact, a Wisconsin company, Wisconsin Vision, owned by Darren Horndasch, says that having a union makes his employees more career oriented, more invested in his business and gives him a competitive edge. Jim O'Malley, owner of a print shop in Pittsburgh, says that he values the

union apprenticeship program for his employees. Again, sharing training expenses with the union is a benefit to this small business employer. Ruth Shep, a business owner in West Fargo, North Dakota, says "good jobs support families, they support the community." And she wants to see workers be able to form a union and to have a choice in our economy. Larry Thompson, owner of an Ohio firm, Thompson Electric, recently wrote an op-ed in which he wrote, "our union workers receive the most cutting-edge job training available, and it pays off through lower injury rates, increased productivity and strengthening the ability to serve the people of Ohio."

So I would agree with you. It is cheaper in the short term, this quarter, to try to shave a buck here a buck there. But if you want a successful business, you have to build over the long term. That means having a good, solid, well trained, reliable and productive workforce. And you can't do that on the cheap. And that is why we need the Employee Free Choice Act.

And I yield back to the gentlelady.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Reclaiming my time.

I would like to point out to the gentleman as well, and, Mr. Speaker, you know this, that, in fact, what has been good for unions and for union workers has been good for all workers. Now I have never been a member of a union. But I do know that when I was working in the low-wage workforce that precisely because union workers had gained benefits, increased wages and working standards, that there was a payoff for me as a worker who was not a union member. It meant that over time my wages went up because the union workers were the ones who fought the most for an increase in the minimum wage, not because union workers were receiving minimum wages, but because their fight and struggle for a good-paying union job was a fight and a struggle for ordinary workers, even those who were working at the minimum wage. So the payoff for the union worker and for the organized workforce is that there is a benefit, then, to all of us.

I remember when I was working, Mr. Speaker, as a waitress and scrubbing by on tips that it was precisely because union workers fought for an increase in wages that that benefited me as a non-union worker. And so there are great benefits.

We know that the fight for union wages that are good wages, good benefits and safe working conditions is a fight that pays off both here in the United States and around the world. After all, when employers are allowed to close down union factories here in this country, relocate them to another country where they pay depressed wages, that has a benefit around the world, and it has a direct benefit, a negative consequence to American workers.

□ 1445

And so the strength of being able to organize unions and to bargain collectively for benefits and wages and safe working conditions is one that pays off to all workers in this country, and indeed, pays off to workers around the world.

And let me just throw out another one of these myths, because some have said that if we implement the Employee Free Choice Act, then that's going to result in labor unions engaging in intimidating and harassing behavior towards employees. This seems rather ridiculous Mr. Speaker, that, in fact, when labor unions and workers want to organize, it is not in their interest to harass and intimidate workers. The goal is to bring workers along. And so this is a myth also that has to be destroyed and that indeed, in the present system, the coercion occurs in the other way, the coercion occurs from employers who don't want to see a union workplace.

And look what happens in communities. I happen to live in a district in Maryland in which we have one hotel on a project where the work force is organizing, where there will be good wages and benefits for the service employees at that hotel. And that's a good thing, and I fought for it too. But in the other hotels, that's not happening. And so you can imagine that if we actually lift up workers in one work site, that we have the possibility then of lifting up workers in another work site.

And as you've pointed out, the gentleman from Minnesota has pointed out that, in fact, Mr. Speaker, that means that all workers benefit from the ability to organize to form a union.

And I would yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. I thank you, Congresswoman EDWARDS, for doing this again. So many myths you're busting tonight, so much good information, including the panels that are right next to you.

But I just want to say that, you know, as you're busting myths associated with the Employee Free Choice Act, and I thank you for that, let me just talk about a few other things that unions have done for me and you. Worker compensation. That's because workers fought for it. Social Security, that's a pretty good thing, right? Minimum wage, I'd say that's a thumbs up. The weekend. You want to thank somebody for the weekend, you can thank the union movement. The 8-hour day, prohibitions against child labor so we don't have 9-year-olds slaving away for 14 hours a day 7 days a week. Worker safety, used to be, Congresswoman EDWARDS, that if you lost your thumb at that punch press, they couldn't use you anymore, you just had to leave. Now we've got worker safety and requirements, OSHA. Setting a wage scale. As you pointed out, as a worker who was on the lower end of the wage scale, you could thank the union movement for setting a minimum wage and for setting a wage scale that other employers

had to meet, or they would lose workers because they would come to the higher wage area.

The union movement, as I pointed out a moment ago, contributed to the civil rights movement, for women, for people of color. And even today, so many struggles for union representation are caught up in struggles for empowerment, for people who are legal immigrants to our society, communities of color, women, people who are fighting for a chance in our society. The union movement has done a lot for us all.

I yield back.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. And reclaiming my time from the gentleman, I would say this as well; that, you know, people ask me all the time, even as a Member of Congress, and certainly as a worker, why do you support workers' rights to organize? And it's a pretty simple answer. I support workers' rights to organize because I recognize the benefit that that pays to all of us in our communities. And you know, our small businesses out there want to be able to provide, for example, health care for their employees. And it's really tough for a small business to do that because health care costs have so skyrocketed, and it cuts deeply into even marginal profit lines.

On the other hand, the unions are out there fighting for health care for all of us, for a system that would actually provide health care at a lower cost, affordable and accessible for all of us. What does that mean for small business? It means it takes it off of your, you know, out of your pot. And so that's an important benefit from small business that will only come because we are working together with members of organized labor to fight for health care for all of us.

Let's talk about what it means to have workers in our community who are able to go out and purchase the services of our small businesses and the products produced by all of our businesses. Well, we certainly cannot do that on stagnant wages. And so, when the unions are out there able to organize workers to negotiate contracts with their employers, creating certainty in the workplace, then employers and businesses can work on productivity, can work on efficiency and can work on growth. And this benefits all of us, from those of us who want to go out into the consumer marketplace and purchase a television made by a worker, or those of us who want to go and get the services supported by union workers. And so it's, again, a win-win situation for all of us.

And I'd like to say, as well for our brothers and sisters in organized labor, Mr. Speaker, there are no harder workers than people who get up every day and do the tough jobs, some of them jobs that many of us don't want to do, but need to be done. And so, this notion that somehow we should deprive them of wages and benefits and safe working conditions really goes against our gut,

goes against who we are as Americans, and because we know that from the beginnings of the last century, the hard-fought benefits that you pointed out, of Social Security, of the 8-hour work day, of the 40-hour work week, of setting a minimum scale for a standard for wages and for working conditions, ensuring protections if that thumb was cut off on the production line, these are all things that, because union workers stood on the line and fought the hard, tough, courageous battles for all of us, that whether you're a union worker or not, you get the benefit of that.

Even those of us who are Members of Congress have the benefit of workers having organized. The mere fact that we can put into a retirement system is about workers having organized and fought for those benefits in their workplace. And so the benefits are tremendous for all of us.

And that is why, in all of our communities, as we're talking about spending stimulus dollars to the billions of dollars throughout the States on transportation projects and water and sewer infrastructure and all of the energy infrastructure that we need for the 21st century, what we really need are skilled union workers getting highly paid, you know, wages and benefits and safe working conditions to rebuild our infrastructure for the 21st century. And you can only get that when workers are able to organize.

And so I would yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. And I again want to thank the gentlelady from Maryland, Congresswoman EDWARDS. You're doing a great job here, a great service getting the word out. And I want to lend my voice and thank you. Again, reminding everybody that we are here on the progressive message. The Progressive Caucus has a vision for America that includes workers' rights, and we're talking about that today.

And I just want to say, as I begin to have to wind down, Congresswoman, that I just want to leave with this thought. You know, you and I know that this Congress has been abuzz over the last week, over the whole AIG thing, right? We've been talking about AIG, AIG. And what have we been talking about? These enormous bonuses these folks have been getting. \$165 million in retention bonuses to people who work in the unit of AIG that did all these fancy derivatives that kind of led to this tremendous risk to the American economy.

But this idea of work, executive pay, Congresswoman, is not a new one. In fact, it was 1991, when I was a brand new lawyer, just got out of law school in 1990, and I read a book called *In Search of Excess*. And in this book it talked about executive pay, exorbitant executive pay. 1991. I think I was 25 years old at the time.

What's my point?

My point is, that during the same period of time we've seen flat worker pay.

We've seen worker pay stay stagnant. We've seen people's unemployment rise recently, but we've seen the health care plans have higher co pays, more of a premium every month, and we've seen workers really struggling, and we've seen productivity going up. So we see flat worker pay, increasing productivity, meaning workers are making more stuff and doing more services within the same amount of time, and so the reality is, somebody's got to stand up for the American worker.

I think it's almost time for us to wrap up. I am going to leave that to you, the Congresswoman from Maryland, who's done such a good job in organizing this special order tonight for the Progressive Caucus.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. And if I could make an inquiry of the Speaker how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 14 minutes remain.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You raise a good point. And I know that my colleague from Minnesota, a real leader in the Progressive Caucus, is set to depart. But I will just say this as you're leaving, that this fight for the Employee Free Choice Act is really a fight for justice for the American worker. And it's a fight to set the American worker back on course for productivity and for growth and for success. And so I think that it's time for those of us who believe in the capacity of the American worker to stand up for workers by supporting the Employee Free Choice Act. And you know, Mr. Speaker, the Employee Free Choice Act was just introduced into Congress just a week or so ago, and so it is time now for Members of Congress to really hear, Mr. Speaker, from constituents about their support of the Employee Free Choice Act, and to say to the United States Congress that it is time for workers to get a fair deal.

When I hear you describe, and we read across the papers the excesses of CEO executives in the financial industry, and that ordinary workers have to bear the burden of paying the cost for straightening this system out, it makes me cringe. And the reason that it does, Mr. Speaker, is because it's unfair to workers.

You know, when the auto industry came to the United States Congress and said, we're going to need help, otherwise the auto industry may not survive, you know, many Members of the United States Congress said to auto workers, well, you have to go back and renegotiate your contracts and your deal, talking to workers and telling workers that they to renegotiate their deals. But we haven't been willing really to say to CEOs, I'm sorry but you got quite a deal too. You need to go back and renegotiate that with the American public.

And so I think it's time for us to actually close that gap from CEO pay to worker pay, because it's the workers that prop up, that build this country.

And yet, year after year, decade after decade, workers are losing. And the Employee Free Choice Act is yet another tool that we have that we will provide to workers so that it enables them to organize, to bargain collectively and fairly, as partners at a table, with employers and to say to employers, once again, we don't have anything against your making money, making a profit, building your business. But you cannot do that at the expense of and on the backs of workers.

And I think it's a fairly simple proposition, and I think it is one, Mr. Speaker, that the American public feels very strongly about, that somehow, all of us who get up every day and go to work for a living ought to have good wages, good benefits and safe working conditions, just three simple things.

□ 1500

Because the American worker is not asking anyone, really, for a handout. The American worker is not asking for an easy deal or for a bonus. They are saying fair wages, good and safe working conditions and good benefits. I think that the American worker deserves the opportunity to sit at a bargaining table to decide: I want to have a union; I want to easily sign up and let my coworkers know that I want a union; I want the choice to be able to do that, and then I want to bargain fairly at the bargaining table with the employer. I think that that, Mr. Speaker, is a good deal for the American people.

So I am excited about the prospects. I think it is important for us to destroy the mythology that is taking place from some who don't really believe in the American worker, and I think it is important for us to destroy the mythology of those who believe that just because a worker gets a good wage and good benefits and good working conditions it means that that is the end of the American economy. It is not true. It never has been true, and it will not be true tomorrow.

So I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for joining me this evening to speak up on behalf of the American worker and to speak up and say that the Employee Free Choice Act is about choice. It is not my choice. It is not your choice. Mr. Speaker, it is not your choice. It is the choice of the American worker to choose a union, to bargain fairly, to get a good deal, and to go to work the next morning to take care of themselves and their families.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. DAVIS of California (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of funeral of very close friend.

Mr. GRIFFITH (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of family medical emergency.

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of official business in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. KAPTUR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COHEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTHRIE, for 5 minutes, March 31.

Mr. CASSIDY, for 5 minutes, April 2.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, April 2.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, April 2.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, April 2.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 30, 2009, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1066. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Procurement of Energy Efficient Products (RIN: 1904-AB68) received March 19, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1067. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Formaldehyde, Polymer with 2-Methyloxirane and 4-Nonylphenol; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0794; FRL-8399-5] received March 13, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1068. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement with Germany (Transmittal No. DDTC 141-08), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 39, section 36(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1069. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal and Modification of Certain Entries from the Entity List: Persons Removed or Modified Based on

ERC Annual Review [Docket No.: 090223225-9275-01] (RIN: 0694-AE57) received March 19, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1070. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting a legislative proposal to eliminate the divisions within the Judicial District of North Dakota, leaving unaffected North Dakota's configuration as one judicial district with four places of holding court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1071. A letter from the Director of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Termination of Phase-In Period for Full Concurrent Receipt of Military Retired Pay and Veterans Disability Compensation Based on a VA Determination of Individual Unemployability (RIN: 2900-AN19) received March 19, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1072. A letter from the Director of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — The Dr. James Allen Veteran Vision Equity Act of 2007 (RIN: 2900-AN03) received March 19, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1073. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Tier I — Industry Director Directive on Domestic Production Deduction (DPD) #3 — Field Directive related to compensation Expenses currently deducted but attributable to prior periods. [LMSB-04-0209-004] received March 19, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1074. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — April 2009 (Rev. Rul. 2009-10) received March 20, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1075. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Tax Treatment of Losses from Criminally Fraudulent Investment Arrangements (Rev. Rul. 2009-9) received March 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1076. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Safe Harbor Method for Determining Theft Loss Deductions from Criminally Fraudulent Investment Arrangements (Rev. Proc. 2009-20) received March 20, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1077. A letter from the National Quality Forum, transmitting the Forum's report entitled, "Improving Healthcare Performance: Setting Priorities and Enhancing Measurement Capacity" in accordance with a provision in the Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act of 2008; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1171. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reauthorize the

Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program for fiscal years 2010 through 2014; with amendments (Rept. 111-54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1377. A bill to amend 38, United States Code, to expand veteran eligibility for reimbursement by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for emergency treatment furnished in a non-Department facility, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1513. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2009, the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain service-connected disabled veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-56). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Ms. MATSUI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 289. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 111-57). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PAUL, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 1726. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue a rule with respect to border security searches of electronic devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. BONO MACK (for herself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 1727. A bill to establish guidelines and incentives for States to establish criminal arsonist and criminal bomber registries and to require the Attorney General to establish a national criminal arsonist and criminal bomber registry program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. WATT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BEAN, and Mr. MINNICK):

H.R. 1728. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to reform consumer mortgage practices and provide accountability for such practices, to provide certain minimum standards for consumer mortgage loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 1729. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for the treatment of institutions of higher education as voter registration agencies; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 1730. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 with respect to electric vehicle infrastructure; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MINNICK:

H.R. 1731. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to require any creditor who transfers, sells, or conveys certain residential mortgage loans to third parties to retain an economic interest in a material portion of the credit risk for any such loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. HARMAN (for herself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 1732. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide for standards for energy efficient outdoor lighting; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEE of New York (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 1733. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit against income tax for the cost of passports and other enhanced identification documents required to comply with the June 1, 2009, implementation of the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE of New York (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 1734. A bill to require the Secretary of State to establish passport issuance agencies within 50 miles of all major international border crossings; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 1735. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the direct payment of attorney fees to the attorney representing a prevailing party in certain Social Security Disability Insurance and Supplemental Security Income claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CARNAHAN):

H.R. 1736. A bill to provide for the establishment of a committee to identify and coordinate international science and technology cooperation that can strengthen the domestic science and technology enterprise and support United States foreign policy goals; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BERRY, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 1737. A bill to facilitate the sale of United States agricultural products to Cuba, as authorized by the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Financial Services, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 1738. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the city of Downey, California, regional wastewater treatment

and reclamation facility projects; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 1739. A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to prohibit States from refusing to accept balloting materials solely because the materials are generated through the use of a computer program, are not printed on a specific type of paper, or do not otherwise meet similar extraneous requirements which are not clearly necessary to prevent fraud in the conduct of elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BEAN, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BACA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PERRIELLO, Ms. KOSMAS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BOREN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HODES, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. WELCH, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. NYE, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. KILROY, Mr. BARROW, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. WALZ, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. HINCHAY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SHULER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MASSA, Mr. REYES, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BOYD, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. OBEY, Mr. WAMP, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. POSEY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MACK, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HOYER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PUTNAM, Mrs.

HALVORSON, Mr. KIND, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. LOESACK, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SIRE, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. CANTOR, Ms. FALLIN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MELANCON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. HIMES, Mr. BUYER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia):

H.R. 1740. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase awareness of the risks of breast cancer in young women and provide support for young women diagnosed with breast cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SESTAK, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 1741. A bill to require the Attorney General to make competitive grants to eligible State, tribal, and local prosecutors to establish and maintain certain protection and witness assistance programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 1742. A bill to establish a program to deploy and integrate plug-in electric drive vehicles in multiple regions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California:

H.R. 1743. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the renewable energy credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SPACE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HILL, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. ORTIZ):

H.R. 1744. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to assure meaningful disclosures of the terms of rental-purchase agreements, including disclosures of all costs to consumers under such agreements, to provide certain substantive rights to consumers under such agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1745. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide liability protections for volunteer practitioners at health centers under section 330 of such Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. MICA, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 1746. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to reauthorize the pre-disaster mitigation program of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 1747. A bill to authorize appropriations for the design, acquisition, and construction of a combined buoy tender-icebreaker to replace icebreaking capacity on the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mrs. BIGGERT):

H.R. 1748. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to enhance the investigation and prosecution of mortgage fraud and financial institution fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 1749. A bill to provide assistance to owners of manufactured homes constructed prior to 1976 to purchase Energy Star qualified manufactured homes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BACHMANN (for herself, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 1750. A bill to provide for the use of information in the National Directory of New Hires in enforcing sex offender registration laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Ms. ROY-BAL-ALLARD, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. NUNES, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CAO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 1751. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to permit States to determine State residency for higher education purposes and to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain alien students who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1752. A bill to provide that the usual day for paying salaries in or under the House of Representatives may be established by regulations of the Committee on House Administration; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JONES, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. AKIN):

H.R. 1753. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to include in the definition of the term "aggravated felony" a criminal violation committed by an alien who unlawfully entered the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 1754. A bill to create a systemic risk monitor for the financial system of the United States, to oversee financial regulatory activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARE (for himself, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. LOESACK, and Ms. HIRONO):

H.R. 1755. A bill to award grants to States to establish, enhance, or expand high-quality preschool programs for children ages 3 through 5 in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELLER:

H.R. 1756. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Microloan program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN (for herself and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 1757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage increased access to alternative fuels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. SPACE):

H.R. 1758. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to stimulate and engage in an informed, national, and public dialogue about how to ensure that each student in the United States receives an equitable education that enables the student to achieve his or her maximum academic potential; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 1759. A bill to distribute emission allowances under a domestic cap-and-trade program to facilities in certain domestic energy-intensive industrial sectors and subsectors to prevent an increase in greenhouse gas emissions by manufacturing facilities located in countries without commensurate greenhouse gas regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1760. A bill to mitigate the effects of black carbon emissions in the United States and throughout the world; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr.

HARE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. KILROY):

H.R. 1761. A bill to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to restrict the use of TARP funds for domestic purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona:

H.R. 1762. A bill to repeal section 10(f) of Public Law 93-531, commonly known as the "Bennett Freeze"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. CANTOR):

H.R. 1763. A bill to provide tax relief for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. BERKLEY, and Ms. SUTTON):

H.R. 1764. A bill to require that amounts of assistance provided to financial institutions under the Troubled Asset Relief Program of the Secretary of the Treasury that are returned be used only for assistance for homeowners in accordance with the Making Home Affordable Program of the Secretary; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. TANNER):

H.R. 1765. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to payment for the furnishing of intravenous immune globulin (IVIG) in a patient's home for the treatment of primary immune deficiency diseases and to cover certain disposable pumps as durable medical equipment in place of non-disposable pumps under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEK of Florida:

H.R. 1766. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to authorize the use of Federal supply schedules for the acquisition of environmentally preferable "green" commodities and services and certain other related items by State and local governments; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1767. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the first-time homebuyer credit retroactive to the beginning of 2008 and to permanently extend the credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1768. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for replacing an automobile with a more fuel-efficient automobile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 1769. A bill to expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness in the State of Washington, to designate the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River and Pratt River as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SALAZAR (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado):

H.R. 1770. A bill to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act to establish a program to provide grant assistance to States for the rehabilitation and repair of deficient dams; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. KRATOVIL):

H.R. 1771. A bill to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1772. A bill to modernize, shorten, and simplify the Federal criminal code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself, Mr. MACK, Mr. LATTA, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PENCE, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier of the Navy, either the aircraft carrier designated as CVN-79 or the aircraft carrier designated as CVN-80, should be named the U.S.S. Barry M. Goldwater; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAMP (for himself and Mr. EDWARDS of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and objectives of a National Military Appreciation Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BARROW (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 288. A resolution recognizing the importance of park and recreation facilities and expressing support for the designation of the month of July as "National Park and Recreation Month"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STARK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WATSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WATERS, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. DREIER):

H. Res. 290. A resolution honoring the lives, and mourning the loss, of Sergeant Mark Dunakin, Sergeant Ervin Romans, Sergeant Daniel Sakai, and Officer John Hege, members of the Oakland Police Department in California who were brutally slain in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina):

H. Res. 291. A resolution recognizing the crucial role of assistance dogs in helping wounded veterans live more independent lives, expressing gratitude to The Tower of Hope, and supporting the goals and ideals of creating a Tower of Hope Day; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H. Res. 292. A resolution congratulating the on-premise sign industry for its contributions to the success of small businesses on the occasion of its 63rd Annual International Sign Expo; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H. Res. 293. A resolution commending Martin Brodeur of the New Jersey Devils for breaking the National Hockey League all time regular season wins record; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. INSLEE introduced a bill (H.R. 1773) for the relief of Valerie Plame Wilson; which was referred to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 17: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 22: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. BOCCIERI.

H.R. 24: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COLE, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BACA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. REYES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 104: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 108: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 175: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 207: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DICKS, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 208: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. TEAGUE, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 226: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 233: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 270: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 302: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 303: Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 450: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 503: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 517: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SESTAK, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 557: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 610: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 622: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 716: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 744: Mr. FILNER and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 764: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 816: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 824: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 836: Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 847: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 855: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 873: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 904: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 914: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 917: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 930: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 933: Mr. DENT.
 H.R. 948: Mr. BERRY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. STARK, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. SPACE.
 H.R. 997: Mr. SHADEGG.
 H.R. 1021: Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H.R. 1023: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado and Mr. ROONEY.
 H.R. 1054: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
 H.R. 1055: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 1065: Mr. SHADEGG, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. MITCHELL.
 H.R. 1079: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, and Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 1091: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 1132: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PITTS, Mr. NYE, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
 H.R. 1139: Mr. REICHERT.
 H.R. 1158: Mr. MCCARTHY of California and Mr. PERRIELLO.
 H.R. 1189: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 1206: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. RADANOVICH.
 H.R. 1207: Mr. STARK and Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 1208: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1209: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PENCE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. TERRY, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.
 H.R. 1223: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
 H.R. 1243: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. BOEHNER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. FARR, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOX, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr.

PERLMUTTER, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TANNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 1245: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 1247: Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 1249: Mr. PAUL and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 1250: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1255: Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 1256: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 1261: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. PUTNAM.
 H.R. 1269: Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 1270: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1274: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 1285: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 1296: Mr. ARCURI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HARE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MASSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 1310: Mr. WELCH and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 1324: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. REYES.
 H.R. 1327: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HODES, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1329: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1346: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 1351: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
 H.R. 1375: Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 1392: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
 H.R. 1398: Mr. PITTS and Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 1441: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 1454: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 1473: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
 H.R. 1499: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1509: Mr. NYE and Mr. SCHAUER.
 H.R. 1513: Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 1521: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 1547: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 1551: Mr. WU, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1587: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 1618: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. DRIEHAUS, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 1619: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 1620: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
 H.R. 1624: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
 H.R. 1625: Mr. OLVER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1633: Mr. MASSA, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 1654: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1681: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 1691: Mr. BOCCIERI.
 H.R. 1696: Mr. DELAHUNT.
 H.R. 1707: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
 H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BUYER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. LINDER.
 H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. CASSIDY and Mr. SIMPSON.
 H. Con. Res. 74: Mr. TOWNS.
 H. Res. 22: Ms. TITUS.
 H. Res. 57: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. FARR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HODES, Mr. MULLOOLAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BARROW, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SPACE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SHULER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. PERRIELLO, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H. Res. 109: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 204: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. WALDEN.
 H. Res. 209: Mr. STEARNS.
 H. Res. 230: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. RUSH.
 H. Res. 236: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H. Res. 238: Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H. Res. 247: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. BOCCIERI.
 H. Res. 262: Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H. Res. 270: Mr. REHBERG and Mr. WITTMAN.
 H. Res. 274: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BACA, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SPACE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. KIND, Mr. WU, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. HIGGINS.
 H. Res. 282: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. JONES, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WALZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. KIND, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. DINGELL.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1135: Mr. LATTI.
 H.R. 1319: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 1427: Mr. HIMES.